

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

NATIONAL BURGAL OF STANDARDS 144 A

in and the electronic transfer

NAUGATUCK RIVER BASIN PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUT



AD-A144 072

# PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM CT 00286

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM





COPY

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

H NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

WALTHAM, MASS. 02154

岩岩

**MAY 1981** 

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release; Distribution Unlimited

84 08 09 021

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
1. REPORT NUMBER  CT 00286	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
A TITLE (and Substite) Plymouth Reservoir Dam		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED INSPECTION REPORT	
NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION OF N	ION-FEDERAL	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NEW ENGLAND DIVISION		S CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT HUMBERS	
DEPT. OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEER NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, NEDED 424 TRAPELO ROAD, WALTHAM, MA. 02254		May 1981  13. NUMBER OF PAGES  70  15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If ditterent	trom Controlling Office)	UNCLASSIFIED  184. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING	

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, if different from Report)

#### 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Cover program reads: Phase I Inspection Report, National Dam Inspection Program; however, the official title of the program is: National Program for Inspection of Non-Federal Dams; use cover date for date of report.

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY,

Naugatuck River Basin Plymouth, Connecticut

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Plymouth Reservoir Dam, also known as the Thomaston Reservoir Dam, consists of an earth embankment structure with a maximum height of 25 ft. and a total length of 730 ft. including a 31.7 ft. long concrete and stone masonry overflow spillway located 200 ft. from the right end of the dam. Based on the visual inspection, the dam is judged to be in fair condition. The dam is classified as "Small" in size and with a "High hazard potential.

... description from the comment

# REPLY TO

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS 424 TRAPELO ROAD WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02254

ATTENTION OF:

NEDED

JUL 28 1981

Honorable William A. O'Neill Governor of the State of Connecticut State Capitol Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Dear Governor O'Neill:

Inclosed is a copy of the Plymouth Reservoir Dam (CT-00286) Phase I Inspection Report, prepared under the National Program for Inspection of Non-Federal Dams. This report is based upon a visual inspection, a review of the past performance and a brief hydrological study of the dam. I approve the report and support the findings and recommendations described in Section 7 and ask that you keep me informed of the actions taken to implement them. This follow-up action is vitally important.

Copies of this report have been forwarded to the Department of Environmental Protection, and to the owner, Connecticut Water Company, Clinton, CT. Copies will be available to the public in thirty days.

I wish to thank you and the Department of Environmental Protection for your cooperation in this program.

Sincerely,

Incl As stated C. E. EDGAŘ, III


Colonel, Corps of Engineers Commander and Division Engineer

Accession For  ITIS GRA&I DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification		
By	PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR CT 00286	DAM
Pist Special	Contractor	

NAUGATUCK RIVER BASIN PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUT



PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM



## NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION TO GRAM THASE I INSPECTION REPORT

IDENTIFICATION NO: CT 00286
NAME OF DAM: Plymouth Reservoir Dam (a/k/a Thomaston Reservoir Dam)
TOWN: Plymouth
COUNTY AND STATE: Litchfield County, Connecticut
Tributary to the Naugatuck River
DATE OF INSPECTION: April 28, 1981

## BRIEF ASSESSMENT

Plymouth Reservoir Dam, also known as the Thomaston Reservoir Dam, consists of an earth embankment structure with a maximum height of 25 feet and a total length of 730 feet including a 31.7 foot long concrete and stone masonry overflow spillway located 200 feet from the right end of the dam. The outlet works, located to the left of the spillway, consist of a 12-inch supply main and 10-inch low level outlet or blowoff through the dam, and an upstream gate-house.

The dam is owned by the Connecticut Water Company and impounds Plymouth Reservoir, a storage reservoir for public water supply.

Based on the visual inspection, the dam is judged to be in fair condition. Features that could affect the future integrity of the dam are downstream seepage, the lack of riprap slope protection on the upstream slope above the waterline and settlement of existing riprap, the unknown working condition of the intake gates, and the downstream location of the control valve on the low level outlet or blowoff.

The dam is classified as "Small" in size with a "High" hazard potential. A Test Flood equal to one-half the Probable Maximum
Flood (1/2 PMF) was selected in accordance with the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams. The
Test Flood inflow of 600 cfs results in a Test Flood routed outflow
of 390 cfs that would just reach the top of the dam.

The spillway capacity is 410 cfs or 105 percent of the Test Flood routed outflow.

It is recommended that a qualified, registered engineer be retained to investigate the downstream seepage, the condition and adequacy of the upstream riprap, the condition of the intake gates and the low level outlet or blowoff. In addition, an Operations and Maintenance Manual should be prepared and a downstream warning system should be put into effect.

The owner should implement these recommendations as described herein and in greater detail in Section 7 of this Report within one year of receipt of this Phase I Inspection Report.

Ronald G. Litke, P.E.

Project Engineer

Roald Haestad President







This Phase I Inspection Report on Plymouth Reservoir Dam (CT-00286) has been reviewed by the undersigned Review Board members. In our opinion, the reported findings, conclusions, and recommendations are consistent with the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, and with good engineering judgement and practice, and is hereby submitted for approval.

JOSEPH W. FINEGAN, JR.

MEMBER

Water Control Branch

Engineering Division

Chance Bartina

ARAMAST MAHTESIAN, MEMBER Geotechnical Engineering Branch Engineering Division

CARNEY M. TERZIAN, CHAIRMAN

Design Branch

Engineering Division

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

JOE B. FRYAR

Chief, Engineering Division

# PREFACE

This report is prepared under guidance contained in the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, for Phase I Investigations. Copies of these guidelines may be obtained from the Office of Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C. 20314. The purpose of a Phase I Investigation is to identify expeditiously those dams which may pose hazards to human life or property. The assessment of the general condition of the dam is based upon available data and visual inspections. Detailed investigation, and analyses involving topographic mapping, subsurface investigations, testing, and detailed computational evaluations are beyond the scope of a Phase I Investigation; however, the investigation is intended to identify any need for such studies.

In reviewing this report, it should be realized that the reported condition of the dam is based on observations of field conditions at the time of inspection along with data available to the inspection team. In cases where the reservoir was lowered or drained prior to inspection, such action, while improving the stability and safety of the dam, removes the normal load on the structure and may obscure certain conditions which might otherwise be detectable if inspected under the normal operating environment of the structure.

It is important to note that the condition of a dam depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the dam will continue to represent the

condition of the dam at some point in the future. Only through continued care and inspection can there be any chance that unsafe conditions be detected.

Phase I Inspections are not intended to provide detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. In accordance with the established Guidelines, the Spillway Test Flood is based on the estimated "Probable Maximum Flood" for the region (greatest reasonably possible storm runoff), or fractions thereof. Because of the magnitude and rarity of such a storm event, a finding that a spillway will not pass the test flood should not be interpreted as necessarily posing a highly inadequate condition. The test flood provides a measure of relative spillway capacity and serves as an aide in determining the need for more detailed hydrologic and hydraulic studies, considering the size of the dam, its general condition and the downstream damage potential.

The Phase I Investigation does <u>not</u> include an assessment of the need for fences, gates, no-trespassing signs, repairs to existing fences and railings and other items which may be needed to minimize trespass and provide greater security for the facility and safety of the public. An evaluation of the project for compliance with OSHA rules and regulations is also excluded.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGES
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	i
BRIEF ASSESSMENT	ii - iii
REVIEW BOARD PAGE	iv
PREFACE	v - vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii - ix
OVERVIEW PHOTO	х
LOCATION PLAN	хi
INDEX TO REPORT	
DESCRIPTION	PAGES
1. PROJECT INFORMATION	1 - 9
1.1 GENERAL	1
<ul><li>a. AUTHORITY</li><li>b. PURPOSE OF INSPECTION</li></ul>	1 1
1.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	2 - 5
a. LOCATION b. DESCRIPTION OF DAM AND APPURTENANCES c. SIZE CLASSIFICATION d. HAZARD CLASSIFICATION e. OWNERSHIP f. OPERATOR g. PURPOSE OF DAM h. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION HISTORY i. NORMAL OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE	2 2 - 3 3 3 - 4 4 4 4 5 5
1.3 PERTINENT DATA	6 - 9
2. ENGINEERING DATA	10 - 11
2.1 DESIGN DATA	10
2.2 CONSTRUCTION DATA	10
2.3 OPERATION DATA	10
2.4 EVALUATION OF DATA	11

DES	SCRIPTION	FAGES
3.	VISUAL INSPECTION	12 - 16
	3.1 FINDINGS	12 - 15
	<ul> <li>a. GENERAL</li> <li>b. DAM</li> <li>c. APPURTENANT STRUCTURES</li> <li>d. RESERVOIR AREA</li> <li>e. DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL</li> </ul>	12 12 - 13 13 - 15 15
	3.2 EVALUATION	15 ~ 16
4.	OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	17
	4.1 OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	17
	<ul><li>a. GENERAL</li><li>b. DESCRIPTION OF ANY WARNING SYSTEM IN EFFECT</li></ul>	<u>;</u>
	4.2 MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	<b>.</b> (
	<ul><li>a. GENERAL</li><li>b. OPERATING FACILITIES</li></ul>	17 17
	4.3 EVALUATION	17
5.	EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC FEATURES	18 - 21
	5.1 GENERAL	18
	5.2 DESIGN DATA	18 - 19
	5.3 EXPERIENCE DATA	19
	5.4 TEST FLOOD ANALYSIS	19 - 20
	5.5 DAM FAILURE ANALYSIS	20 - 21
6.	EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY	22 - 23
	6.1 VISUAL OBSERVATION	22
	6.2 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION DATA	22
	6.3 POST-CONSTRUCTION CHANGES	22 - 23
	6.4 SEISMIC STABILITY	23

CESCRIPTION		FACES	
7.	ASSESS!	MENT, RECLAMMENDATIONS AND REMEDIAL MEASURES	24 - 25
	7.1 DA	M ASSESSMENT	24
	ā. b. c.	CONDITION ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION URGENCY	2 4 2 4 2 4
	7.2 KF	CLMMENDATIONS	24 - 25
	7.3 RE	MEDIAL MEASURES	25
	а.	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	25
	7.4 AL	TERNATIVES	25

# INDEX TO APPENDIXES

APPENDIX	DESCRIPTION	PAGES
А	INSPECTION CHECKLIST	A-1 - A-7
В	ENGINEERING DATA	B-1 - B-58
С	PHOTOGRAPHS	C-1 - C-7
D	HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS	D-1 - D-20
E	INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN THE	




NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED DAMS

Called with the property

Consiste Consiste

HOALD HAESTAD, INC.



# 

#### PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM

# PROJECT INFORMATION SECTION 1

#### 1.1 General

## a. Authority

Public Law 92-367, August 8, 1972, authorized the Secretary of the Army, through the Corps of Engineers, to initiate a National Program of Dam Inspection throughout the United States. The New England Division of the Corps of Engineers has been assigned the responsibility of supervising the inspection of dams within the New England Region. Roald Haestad, Inc., has been retained by the New England Division to inspect and report on selected dams in the State of Connecticut. Authorization and notice to proceed were issued to Roald Haestad, Inc. under a letter of March 30, 1981, from William E. Hodgson, Jr., Colonel, Corps of Engineers. Contract No. DACW33~80-C-0048 has been assigned by the Corps of Engineers for this work.

## b. Purpose of Inspection

The purposes of the program are to:

- Perform technical inspection and evaluation of nonfederal dams to identify conditions requiring correction in a timely manner by non-federal interest.
- Encourage and prepare the States to quickly initiate effective dam inspection programs for non-federal dams.
- To update, verify and complete the National Inventory of Dams.

# 1.2 Description of Project

# a. Location

The dam is located in the Town of Plymouth opposite the intersection of Blakeman Road with North Street. The dam is shown on the Thomaston U.S.G.S. Quadrangle map having coordinates of latitude N41°-41.1' and longitude W73°-03.2'.

# b. Description of Dam and Appurtenances

The Plymouth Reservoir Dam, also known as the Thomaston Reservoir Dam, is an earth embankment structure with a total length of 730 feet, including a 31.7 foot long concrete and stone masonry overflow spillway located 200 feet from the right end of the dam. The outlet works are located to the left of the spillway. The earth embankment has a top width of 15 feet, an upstream slope of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical, and a downstream slope that varies from 3-1/4 horizontal to 1 vertical at the spillway to 5 horizontal to 1 vertical near the left abutment of the dam. The upstream slope is protected by a layer of riprap. There are sand and gravel drainage blankets on the downstream slopes which connect to 8-inch corrugated metal toe drains that outlet into the spillway discharge channel. Plans indicate that a cemented rubble masonry corewall extends the entire length of the dam. According to the Plans the bottom of the corewall is 5 feet below the original grade and the top of the corewall is 1-1/2 feet below the top of the dam. In 1975 test borings were made and piezometers were installed.

The spillway consists of a concrete and stone masonry structure. The lower portion of the spillway is constructed of stepped stone masonry, while the upper 5 feet consists of a concrete

everflow weir. In 1977, dabions were placed against the incide face of the downstream concrete training walls in order to install drainage blankets and flatten the downstream slopes of the dam.

At the left end of the dam there is a 50 foot long emergency earth spillway with a maximum depth of 1 foot below the crest of the dam.

The outlet works consist of a gatehouse containing manually operated intake gate valves at varying elevations, and screening facilities. A 12-inch pipe through the dam transports water from the gatehouse to chemical treatment facilities below the dam where reservoir water is treated prior to entering the distribution system. A 10-inch low level outlet or blowoff pipe discharges into the brook below the dam. It is not known how this pipe is connected to the reservoir or gatehouse. At the present time the outlet is controlled by a downstream gate.

# c. Size Classification - "Small"

According to the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, a dam is classified as "Small" in size if the height is between 25 feet and 40 feet or the dam impounds between 50 Acre-Feet and 1,000 Acre-Feet of water. The dam has a maximum height of 25 feet and a maximum storage capacity of 390 Acre-Feet. Therefore, the dam is classified as "Small" in size.

# d. Hazard Classification - "High"

Based upon the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines

for Safety Inspection of Dams, the hazard classification of the

dam is "High". A dam failure analysis indicates that a failure

of the Plymouth Reservoir Dam could result in the loss of more than a few lives.

The calculated flood wave would overtop North Street by about 9 feet, inundate two houses and the Connecticut Water Company Treatment Facilities immediately below the dam, then continue down the valley where it would overtop Altair Avenue and Railroad Street by up to 11 feet and flood five houses on the south side of Railroad Street to a depth of 2 to 10 feet. The flood waters would then overtop a downstream railroad embankment by about 3 feet and discharge to the Naugatuck River. The impoundment created by the railroad embankment would flood several houses to a maximum depth of 15 feet.

Prior to dam breach the maximum spillway discharge would overtop North Street, Altair Avenue and Railroad Street by about 1 foot flooding one house downstream of Railroad Street to an unknown depth.

#### e. Ownership

Former Owner: Thomaston Water Company

Present Owner: Connecticut Water Company

93 West Main Street

Clinton, Connecticut 06413

(203) 669-8636

Kenneth Kells, Supervisor

#### f. Operator

William Dunn, Division Manager Connecticut Water Company Naugatuck Division 250 Meadow Street Naugatuck, Connecticut 06770 (203) 729-8241

#### g. Purpose of Dam

The dam impounds Plymouth Reservoir, a storage reservoir for public water supply.

# h. Design and Construction History

The dam was designed by William B. Rider, Hydraulic Lagrager, in 1880, and constructed by Fred T. Ley and Company, Contractors, between 1880 - 1881. In 1910 the dam was raised 16 inches and the embankment strengthened. In 1921 additional work involving riprap on the dam was performed. In 1977 repairs were made to the dam which consisted of placing gabions inside the concrete spillway walls in order to install downstream drainage blankets and toe drains, and to flatten the downstream slopes. The repairs were designed by Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., and constructed by the Connecticut Water Company.

# i. Normal Operating Procedures

The upper intake gate is left open and water is drawn from the reservoir when storage is adequate.

#### 1.3 Pertinent Data

#### a. Drainage Area

The drainage area consists of 0.57 square miles of "rolling" wooded hills with scattered residential development.

#### b. Discharge at Damsite

Discharge at the damsite is over the 31.7 foot long overflow spallway. A 12-inch supply main transports water from the reservoir to the distribution system, and a 10-inch low level outlet or blowoff discharges downstream of the dam.

1. Outlet Works (conduits) Size:

Supply Main: 12-inch
Low Level Outlet: 10-inch

Invert Elevation at Gatehouse:

Supply Main: 672+ Low Level Outlet: 672+

Discharge Capacity:

Supply Main: Unknown Low Level Outlet: 6 cfs

2. Maximum Known Flood at Damsite: Unknown, did not overtop in

1938 or 1955

· A water promise or the

3. Ungated Spillway Capacity at Top of Dam:

at Top of Dam: 410 cfs Elevation: 694.5

4. Ungated Spillway Capacity

at Test Flood Elevation: 390 cfs Elevation: 694.5 (-)

5. Gated Spillway Capacity at Normal Pool Elevation:

at Normal Pool Elevation: N/A Elevation: N/A

6. Gated Spillway Capacity at Test Flood Elevation:

at Test Flood Elevation: N/A Elevation: N/A

7. Total Spillway Capacity

at Test Flood Elevation: 390 cfs Elevation: 694.5 (-)

8. Total Project Discharge

at Top of Dam: 410 cfs Elevation: 694.5

9. Total Project Discharge

at Test Flood Elevation: 390 cfs Elevation: 694.5 (-)

c.	Elc	vation - Peet Makee Mountage Lovel		
	1.	Streambed at Toe of Dam:	67 :.1	
	2.	Bottom of Cutoff:	664.5	
	3.	Maximum Tailwater:	N/A	
	4.	Normal Pool:	692.0	
	5.	Full Flood Control Pool:	N/A	
	6.	Spillway Crest:	692.0	
	7.	Design Surcharge - Original Design:	694.5	
	8.	Top of Dam:	694.5	
	9.	Test Flood Surcharge:	694.5 (-)	
d.	Reservoir - Length in Feet			
	1.	Normal Pool:	3,200 feet	
	2.	Flood Control Pool:	N/A	
	3.	Spillway Crest Pool:	3,200 feet	
	4.	Top of Dam:	3,300 feet	
	5.	Test Flood Pool:	3,300 feet	
e.	Sto	orage - Acre-feet		
	1.	Normal Pool:	290 Acre-Feet	
	2.	Flood Control Pool:	N/A	
	3.	Spillway Crest Pool:	290 Acre-Feet	
	4.	Top of Dam:	390 Acre-Feet	
	5.	Test Flood Pool:	390 Acre-Feet	
f.	Reservoir Surface - Acres			
	1.	Normal Pool:	36.7 Acres	
	2.	Flood-Control Pool:	N/A	
	3.	Spillway Crest:	36.7 Acres	
	4.	Test Flood Pool:	40.7 Acres	
	5.	Top of Dam:	40.7 Acres	

g. Dam

1. Type: Earth Embankment

730 feet

3. Height:

2. Length:

25 feet

Top Width: 4.

15 feet

5. Side Slopes:

Upstream: 3 horizontal to 1 vertical

Downstream: Varies 3.25 - 5 horizontal to

1 vertical

6. Zoning:

Original embankment of selected gravel and clay constructed by puddling. Drainage blanket consisting of 18-inches of concrete sand over original embankment, with remaining embankment of

bankrun gravel.

7.

Impervious Core: Cemented rubble masonry core wall to within 1.5 feet of top of dam. 3 feet wide at top; 5 feet

wide at base.

8. Cutoff:

Core wall extends 5 feet below original ground.

Contraction of the Contract of

9. Grout Curtain:

None

10. Other:

Diversion and Regulating Tunnel - N/A h.

i. Spillway

1. Type: broad crested overflow weir. Upper portion

of concrete; lower portion of stepped stone

masonry.

2. Length of Weir: 31.7 feet

3. Crest Elevation

with Flash Boards: N/A without Flash Boards: 692.0

4. Gates: N/A

5. Upstream Channel: Stone-lined approach channel with concrete

training walls.

6. Downstream Channel: Stone-filled mat (gabions) at base of

spillway. Flows into 48-inch culvert that

discharges to natural stream.

7. General:

j. Regulating Outlets

1. Invert: 672<sup>±</sup>

2. Size: 10-inch

3. Description: Cast iron pipe through dam; outlet end is

asbestos cement pipe.

4. Control Mechanism: Manually operated downstream gate.

5. Other: 12-inch supply main

# 

#### 2.1 Design Data

Information on the original design is listed in a report entitled "Investigation of Seepage and General Condition of the Plymouth Reservoir Dam" by Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., August 19, 1975. See Appendix B, pages B-28 through B-46. The report refers to the Contract Documents for the original dam. Also included in the report are soil borings and design recommendations for repairs to the dam. Computations by Metcalf and Eddy, Inc. for flood routing of a 100-year storm were available and reviewed. Plans and Specifications entitled "Town of Plymouth, Thomaston Water Company, Plymouth Reservoir Dam Repairs", Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., 7/21/77, were available and reviewed. Also available was an inspection report prepared for the State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection, by S. E. Minor and Company, Inc., Civil Engineers, July 15, 1974, and plans of the dam and gatehouse prepared by The Henry Souther Engineering Company in 1932.

#### 2.2 Construction Data

Construction data consists of the Plans and Specifications for the repairs to the dam in 1977, and inspection photos, reports and notes by the Connecticut Water Company concerning the repairs.

# 2.3 Operation Data

Lake levels are recorded weekly, and do not necessarily coincide with maximum water levels. It was reported that the dam
did not overtop during the hurricane floods of 1938 and 1955.

Monthly inspection reports and records of the piezometer readings
are available from the Connecticut Water Company.

# 2.4 Evaluation of Data

# a. Availability

Existing data was available from the Connecticut Water Company and the State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection.

# b. Adequacy

The information that was available, along with the visual inspection, past performance history, and hydraulic and hydrologic calculations were adequate to assess the condition of the dam.

# c. Validity

Field inspections and surveys revealed that the dam is constructed substantially as indicated by the existing data. The length of the spillway weir following the 1977 repairs is 31.7 feet, as opposed to the 40 foot length used in the flood routing for the 100-year design storm.

# AIRCAL INCHESTING

#### 3.1 Findings

#### a. General

The visual inspection of the dam was conducted on April 28, 1981. The inspection team was accompanied by Mr. Kenneth Kells and Mr. Roland Baillargeon of the Connecticut Water Company. At the time of the inspection the water level was slightly below spillway level.

The Plymouth Reservoir Dam consists of an earth embankment structure with a concrete and stone masonry overflow spillway located 200 feet from the right end of the dam and outlet works at the left end of the spillway, Photos 1 and 2.

The general condition of the dam at the time of inspection was fair.

#### b. Dam

The crest of the dam is grass-covered and appears to be fairly level for the entire length of the dam, Photo 2. In cross section, the crest appears to be somewhat rounded and tire paths are evident on the left side of the dam, Photo 3. At the right end of the dam there is a dug well which supplies water to a downstream house. At the time of inspection, the water level in the well was about 10 inches lower than the reservoir level. The upstream slope is protected by a layer of riprap which extends to a maximum of 1 foot above the waterline, Photos 2 and 3. A portion of the riprap near the left end of the dam appears to have settled slightly.

The downstream slope is covered with grass, Photos 1 and 4. A wet area approximately 30 feet long and 8 feet wide,

on the downstream slope of the dam, Photo 4. The area was naturated and contained numerous animal footprints approximately 3 - 4 inches deep that were filled with water. There was no noticable flow of water from this area. Some seepage was observed in the gutter of the road near the left end of the dam, Photo 5. The area was covered with rust-colored floccules, however, the seepage appeared clear at the time of inspection. The seepage flows into a 24-inch perforated, corrugated metal pipe drain, and discharges into a 48-inch culvert downstream of the spillway. The flow at the discharge end of the 24-inch drain was approximately 1 gpm.

Plans indicate that sand and gravel drainage blankets were constructed on the downstream slopes and discharge into 8-inch ACCMP toe drains which outlet into the spillway discharge channel, Photo 6. There was no flow discharging from either toe drain at the time of inspection, however, the left toe drain was wet. A 15-inch perforated, corrugated metal pipe storm drain at the right side of the spillway discharge channel was discharging approximately 5 gpm at the time of inspection. The total flow at the discharge end of the 48-inch culvert under the Town road was 15 gpm.

Six piezometers are present on the downstream slope, four to the left of the spillway and two to the right. Records of past readings are contained in Appendix B, pages B-55 - B-58.

#### c. Appurtenant Structures

The appurtenant structures consist of the overflow spillway, the outlet works and an emergency earth spillway.

# $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$

The overflow spillway consists of a concrete and stone massonry structure, Photos 7 and 8. The lower portion of the spillway is constructed of stepped stone masonry with the joints plastered with mortar. The upper portion and weir are constructed of concrete. The concrete appears to be in good condition with some minor spalling of the concrete training walls below the waterline. The left end of the spillway crest was wet indicating that this end may be slightly lower in elevation. At the right end of the spillway, a puddle on the stone masonry at the base of the concrete section may indicate seepage between the concrete and stone masonry. The concrete training walls were lined with stone filled gabions when the downstream slopes were flattened and drainage blankets installed. A filter fabric is present between the embankment and the gabions. The gabions appear to be in good condition, Photos 7 and 8, with no settlement observed behind them. The installation of the gabions reduced the spillway length from 40 feet to 31.7 feet.

#### Outlet Works

The outlet works consist of a gatehouse located at the left end of the spillway and a 12-inch supply main and 10-inch low level outlet or blowoff through the dam. The stone masonry of the gatehouse appears to have been recently mortared and to be in good condition, Photo 9. The working condition of three manually operated intake gates is unknown. The low level outlet or blowoff and the supply main are normally controlled by gates located downstream of the road near the filter plant. The gatehouse also contains a screen chamber and compressor for an aeration system, Photo 10. The low level outlet or blowoff discharges through a 10-inch asbestos cement pipe approximately 200 feet below the dam, Photo 11.

## Emergency Spillway

There is an earth emergency spillway at the left end of the dam, Photo 12. The spillway discharges into the roadway which runs parallel to the toe of the dam.

#### d. Reservoir Area

There were no indications of instability along the edges of the reservoir in the vicinity of the dam.

#### e. Downstream Channel

Immediately downstream of the spillway the channel floor is lined with a stone-filled mat, Photo 6. Approximately 50 feet downstream of the dam the spillway channel flows into a 48-inch reinforced concrete culvert under a Town road and then into a natural streambed. The natural streambed consists of gravel and cobbles. There are trees overhanging the stream and the remains of a small dam are located several hundred feet below the spillway.

#### 3.2 Evaluation

Based on the visual observations, the dam appears to be in fair condition. The following features could affect the future integrity of the dam:

- Seepage downstream of the dam and on the downstream slope may cause internal erosion leading to piping failure of the embankment.
- 2. The lack of riprap above the waterline and continued settlement of the existing riprap on the upstroam slope may lead to erosion and reduction of crest width.
- 3. The use of the downstream gates to control flow and the unknown working condition of the intake gates permit

full water pressure to exist in the outlet pipes through the dam and may not allow for flow to be shut off in the event of a leak in the outlet pipes.

# SECTION 4

## 4.1 Operational Procedures

#### a. General

Plymouth Reservoir is a water storage reservoir which is used to supplement alternate sources of water supply. Water is drawn from the reservoir when the storage is adequate. The upper intake gate in the gatehouse remains open at all times and flow is controlled by a downstream gate. The downstream low level outlet or blowoff gate is operated once a year. The dam is inspected on a monthly basis by maintenance personnel and semi-annually by the owner's Engineering Department. Water levels in the piczometers are read as part of all the inspections.

# b. Description of Any Warning System in Effect

A formal warning system is being prepared for the dam.

At the present time the dam is monitored during large storms.

#### 4.2 Maintenance Procedures

#### a. General

The grass on the dam is mowed once a month during the mowing season.

#### b. Operating Facilities

The low level outlet or blowoff is opened once a year to insure its operation. The screens within the gatehouse are cleaned annually.

#### 4.3 Evaluation

Present Operational and Maintenance Procedures are generally adequate but need to be improved. In addition to the formal warning system which is currently being prepared, an Operations and Maintenance Manual should be prepared for the dam.

# SECTION E

## 5.1 General

The spillway at Plymouth Reservoir Dam consists of a 31.7 foot long broad-crested overflow weir with a stepped downstream face of mortared stone masonry. The spillway is located about 200 feet from the right end of the dam. The top of the dam is about 2.5 feet above the spillway level.

Stone filled gabions have been placed inside the downstream concrete training walls in order to install drainage blankets on the downstream slopes of the dam. Approximately 50 feet downstream of the spillway, the spillway channel flows into a 48-inch reinforced concrete culvert under a Town road (North Street).

The dam has a maximum height of 25 feet and a storage capacity of 390 Acre-Feet with the water level at the top of the dam. A grass-covered emergency spillway with a length of 50 feet and a maximum depth of about 1 foot below the crest of the dam is located at the left abutment. The capacity of this spillway was given as only 5 to 8 cfs, and therefore was not included in the Test Flood computations. (See pages B-15 and B-16 in Appendix B.)

The tributary watershed area is 0.57 square miles of "rolling" wooded hills with scattered residential development. The watershed elevations range from 950 feet at the north end to 692 feet at the dam.

#### 5.2 Design Data

The spillway and dam were rebuilt in 1977, as designed by Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., of Boston, Massachusetts. The Konnison-

Colby Rare Flood Method was used to develop the inflow hydrograph for a 100-year design storm. The beak inflow was calculated to be 850 cfs with a depth of runoff of 7.09 inches and a peak outflow of 362 cfs. A 40 foot spillway length was used in the computations; actual spillway length after reconstruction is 31.7 feet. The computations are shown in Appendix B, pages B-12 through B-27.

## 5.3 Experience Data

It was reported that the dam did not overtop during the hurricane floods of 1938 and 1955.

## 5.4 Test Flood Analysis

Based on the dam failure analysis, the dam is classified as "High" hazard potential. The dam was classified as "Small" in size based on a height of 25 feet and a storage capacity of 390 Acre-Feet. According to the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, the Test Flood for a "Small" dam with a "High" hazard potential should be in the range of one-half the Probable Maximum Flood (1/2 PMF) to the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF).

A Test Flood equal to the 1/2 PMF was selected because of the low hydraulic height and small storage capacity of the dam. The Test Flood was calculated using a peak inflow for the PMF of 2,125 cubic feet per second per square mile (csm) from the minimum two square mile drainage area shown on the Corps of Engineers' Guide Curves for "rolling" terrain and the 0.57 square mile watershed of Plymouth Reservoir Dam. The peak 1/2 PMF inflow was calculated to be 600 cfs, resulting in a routed outflow of 390 cfs.

The Test Flood was routed through the impoundment in accordance

with the Corps of Engineers' procedures for "Estimating the Effect of Surcharge Storage on Probable Maximum Discharges". The impoundment was assumed to be initially at spillway level. The spillway is capable of discharging 410 cfs or 105 percent of Test Flood routed outflow.

# 5.5 Dam Failure Analysis

The Corps of Engineers' '"Rule of Thumb" Guidance for Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydrographs' was used to calculate the peak outflow due to a dam failure. Failure was assumed with the water level at the top of the dam. The 16 foot deep by 152 foot long breach would release up to 16,500 cfs into the stream channel below the dam.

Because of the minimal storage of the steep, narrow downstream channel, the flood peak was assumed not to be reduced. Depths of flow were determined at each section for the dam breach flood wave. The spillway was assumed to be included in the breach and therefore the spillway discharge was not added to the breach flow.

The flood wave would overtop North Street by about 9 feet and would inundate two houses and the Connecticut Water Company Treatment Facilities on North Street immediately below the dam to a depth of 1 to 5 feet. The depth of flow in the stream channel would be about 15 feet and would flood five houses on the south side of Railroad Street to a depth of 2 to 10 feet. The flood wave would continue down the valley and overtop Altair Avenue and Railroad Street by up to 11 feet. See Figure 5, page D-20. The flood waters would overtop a downstream railroad embankment by about 3 feet and discharge to the Naugatuck River. The impoundment

created by the railroad embankment would flood several houses to a maximum depth of 15 feet.

Prior to dam breach, the spillway flow of about 400 cfs would overtop North Street immediately below the dam by about 1 foot. After crossing the road the flow would return to the stream where it would continue down the steep narrow channel at a depth of about 3 feet. The house sills in this area are about 14 feet above the stream channel. Altair Avenue and Railroad Street would be overtopped by about 1 foot, causing flooding of one house on the downstream side of Railroad Street to an unknown depth. The railroad embankment would impound water to a depth of about 8 feet without flooding homes.

The failure of Plymouth Reservoir Dam could result in the loss of more than a few lives. Therefore, the dam is classified as "High" hazard potential.

# EVALUATION OF SIMUSTORAL STABILITY SECTION 6

## 6.1 Visual Observations

The visual observations did not disclose any evidence of present or past structural instability. The future integrity of the dam could be affected by:

- Downstream seepage;
- 2. Lack of riprap above the waterline and the settlement of existing riprap; and
- 3. The unknown condition of the intake gates and the downstream location of the control valve for the low level outlet or blowoff.

## 6.2 Design and Construction Data

Information on the original design and construction procedures is listed in a report entitled "Investigation of Seepage and General Condition of the Plymouth Reservoir Dam", by Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., August 19, 1975. Design Plans and Specifications for repairs to the dam in 1977 and flood routing for a 100-year storm were available and reviewed.

## 6.3 Post-Construction Changes

Since the original construction of the dam in 1880-1881, the following changes have been made:

- The dam was raised 16 inches and the embankment strengthened in 1910.
- 2. Additional work involving riprap was performed in 1921.

3. In 1977, gabions were placed inside the concrete training walls to allow for the installation of downstream drainage blankets and toe drains, and the flattening of the downstream slopes.

## 6.4 Siesmic Stability

The dam is located is Seismic Zone l and in accordance with the recommended Phase I Guidelines, does not warrant seismic stability analysis.

## ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS, & REMEDIAL MEASURES SECTION 7

#### 7.1 Dam Assessment

#### a. Condition

On the basis of the visual inspection, the dam is judged to be in fair condition. The future integrity of the dam could be affected by:

- Downstream seepage;
- 2. The lack of riprap above the waterline and the settlement of the existing riprap; and
- 3. The unknown condition of the intake gates and the downstream location of the control valve for the low level outlet or blowoff.

An evaluation of the hydraulic and hydrologic features of the dam determined that the spillway is capable of passing 105 percent of the Test Flood routed outflow.

## b. Adequacy of Information

The information available was sufficient for performing a Phase I Inspection.

#### c. Urgency

The recommendations presented in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 should be carried out by the owner within one year of receipt of this report.

## 7.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations should be carried out under the direction of a qualified, registered engineer:

1. Investigate the significance of the seepage observed

downstream of the dam and the wet area on the downstream slope and the ineffectiveness of the drainage blankets.

Design and construct remedial or monitoring measures, as required.

- 2. Investigate the condition and adequacy of the upstream riprap and design repairs as required.
- 3. Investigate the condition of the intake gates and recommend necessary repairs to place them in operation.
- 4. Investigate the low level outlet or blowoff and design an upstream shutoff gate.

The owner should implement all the recommendations made by the engineer.

## 7.3 Remedial Measures

## a. Operation and Maintenance Procedures

- 1. Fill and reseed tire paths on the dam crest.
- An Operations and Maintenance Manual should be prepared.
- 3. The downstream warning system should be completed and put into effect.

## 7.4 Alternatives

There are no practical alternatives to the above recommendations.

## APPENDIX A

VISUAL CHECK LIST WITH COMMENTS

# TERRITOR OF CAMERATION

PROJECT: Plymouth Keserver Dan	
DATE: 4,728/81 TIME: 8:45 d.m. WEATHER: 310	oudy ide
W.S. ELEVATION: $\frac{6^{\circ}1.9}{0.1^{\circ}}$ U.S. $\frac{N/A}{0.1^{\circ}}$ DN.S	5
PARTY	DISCIPLINE
Roald Haestad, P.E Roald Haestad, Inc.	Civil/Geotechnical
2. Ronald G. Litke, P.E Roald Haestad, Inc.	Civil/Structural
3. Donald L. Smith, P.E Roald Haestad, Inc.	Civil/Hydrologic
4. Kenneth Kells, P.E Connecticut Water Company	Owner's representative
5. Roland Baillargeon - Connecticut Water Company	Owner's representative
6	
INSPECTED PROJECT FEATURE BY	<u>REMARKS</u> Good; some downstream seep-
1. Dam Embankment RH,RGL,DLS	ade and wet areas.
Intake Structure 2. Outlet Works - & Channel RH,RGL,DLS	Under water; could not be observed.
3. Outlet Works - Control Tower RH, RGL, DLS	Operating condition of gates unknown.
Transition 4. Outlet Works - and Conduit RH,RGL,DLS	12-inch and 1(-inch cast iron pipes through dam
Outlet Structure  5. Outlet Works - and Channel RH, RGL, DLS	No structure; pipe dischar- ges to stream below dam
Spill. Weir, Appr.  6. Outlet Works - & Discharge Chan. RH, RGL, DLS	Good condition
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	

#### the second and received contact EIST

PROJECT: Flymouth Reservoir Dam	DATE: 4 1 4781		
PROJECT FEATURE: Dam Dimbankment	NAME: EH		
DISCIPLINE: Civil Engineers	NAME: RGL,DLS		
AREA ELEVATION  DAM EMBANKMENT	CONDITIONS		
CREST ELEVATION	694.5		
CURRENT POOL ELEVATION	691.9		
MAXIMUM IMPOUNDMENT TO DATE	Unknown		
SURFACE CRACKS	None observed		
PAVEMENT CONDITION	Crest is grass-covered; tire paths on crest		
MOVEMENT OR SETTLEMENT OF CREST	None observed		
LATERAL MOVEMENT	None observed		
VERTICAL ALIGNMENT	Good		
HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT	Good		
CONDITION AT ABUTMENT AND AT CONCRETE STRUCTURES	Good; no settlement noted		
INDICATIONS OF MOVEMENT OF STRUCTURAL ITEMS ON SLOPES	None observed		
TRESPASSING ON SLOPES	Animal footprints in wet area on downstream slope		
VEGETATION ON SLOPES	Grass-covered; good condition		
SLOUGHING OR EROSION OF SLOPES OR ABUTMENTS	None observed		
ROCK SLOPE PROTECTION - RIPRAP FAILURES	Riprap does not extend much above the waterline; I foot maximum in some areas; settlement noted near left end.		
UNUSUAL MOVEMENT OR CRACKING AT OR NEAR TOES	None observed		
EMBANKMENT OR DOWNSTREAM SEEPAGE	Some seepage in gutter of road near left end. 30' x 8' wet area on downstream slope 100' left of spillway.		
PIPING OR BOILS	None observed		
FOUNDATION DRAINAGE FEATURES	No water discharging from toe drains.		
TOE DRAINS	No water discharging from toe drains; left drain is wet.		
INSTRUMENTATION SYSTEM	Six piezometers on downstream slope; 15 reported; others broken off or below surface.		

## PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PRO	DUECT: llwmouth Belliver bam	DATE:	DATE: 4 7 7 61	
PRO	In DJECT FEATURE: Outlet Works - In	take Channel and take Structure NAME: EH		
DIS	SCIPLINE: Civil Engineers	NAME: RGL,	DLS	
	AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS		
	TLET WORKS - INTAKE Annel and Intake structure	Under water:		
Α.	APPROACH CHANNEL:	could not be observed		
	SLOPE CONDITIONS			
	POTTOM CONDITIONS			
	ROCK SLIDES OR FALLS	N/A		
	LOG BOOM	N/A ~		
	DEBRIS			
	CONDITION OF CONCRETE			
	DRAINS OR WEEP HOLES			
в.	INTAKE STRUCTURE:	Under water; could not be obse	rved	
	CONDITION OF CONCRETE			
	STOP LOGS AND SLOTS	N/A		

## February 150 Editor Chieff (Kiels)

PROJECT:   Flom. uth F	a servoir Dam	DATE:	4 26761
PROJECT FEATURE:	outlet Works - Control	Tower NAME:	RH .
DISCIPLINE: Civil	Engineers	NAME:	RGL,DLS
AREA EV	ALUATED	CONDITION	NS
OUTLET WORKS - CO	NTROL TOWER		
A. CONCRETE AND	STRUCTURAL:		
GENERAL CONDI	TION	Good	
CONDITION OF	JOINTS	No joints observed	
SPALLING		None observed	
VISIBLE REINF	DRCING	None observed	
RUSTING DR ST.	AINING OF CONCRETE	Rusting of walkway due of piping.	
ANY SEEPAGE D	R EFFLORESCENCE	None observed	
JOINT ALIGNME	NT	No joints observed	
UNUSUAL SEEPA IN GATE CHAMB		Chamber normally full	of water.
CRACKS		None observed	
RUSTING OR COR	RROSION OF STEEL	None observed	
B. MECHANICAL AND	D ELECTRICAL:		
AIR VENTS		N,/A	
FLOAT WELLS		N/A	
CRANE HOIST	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	N/A	
ELEVATO?		N/A	
HYDRAULIC SYST	EM	N/A	
SERVICE GATES		Operating condition ur	nknown
EMERGENCY GATE	:s	N/A	
LIGHTNING PROT	ECTION SYSTEM	N/A	
EMERGENCY POWE	R SYSTEM	N/A	
WIRING AND LIC IN GATE CHAMBE		Good; used for acratic	on system

## PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PROJECT: Plymouth Reservoir Dam	DATE: 4/20001
PROJECT FEATURE: Outlet Works - Transition	& Conduit NAME: EH
DISCIPLINE: Civil Engineers	NAME: RGL, DLS
AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS
DUTLET WORKS - TRANSITION AND CONDUIT	
GENERAL CONDITION OF CONCRETE	supply main and 10-inch cast iron low level outlet or blowoff
RUST OR STAINING ON CONCRETE	
SPALLING	
EROSION OR CAVITATION	
CRACKING	
ALIGNMENT OF MONOLITHS	
ALIGNMENT OF JOINTS	
NUMBERING OF MONOLITHS	

#### The Branch of the Control of the Con

PROJECT: Plymouth Reservoir Dam	CATE: 4 - 1 - 1
PROJECT FEATURE: Outlet Works - outlet C	rusture evil name: BH
DISCIPLINE: <u>Civil Engineers</u>	NAME: FGL, DLS
AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS
DUTLET WORKS - DUTLET STRUCTURE AND DUTLET CHANNEL	No outlet structure; low level outlet or blowoff pipe discharges to natural
GENERAL CONDITION OF CONCRETE	stream below dam.
RUST OR STAINING	
SPALLING	
EROSION OR CAVITATION	
VISIBLE REINFORCING	
ANY SEEPAGE OR EFFLORESCENCE	
CONDITION AT JOINTS	
DRAIN HOLES	
CHANNEL	Natural streambed
LOOSE ROCK OR TREES  OVERHANGING CHANNEL	Some trees overhanging channel
CONDITION OF DISCHARGE CHANNEL	Fair

## FEFTICATO INSPECTION CHECK LIST

= ;, ;	SECT: Floresati For a voir Dan	4.2~ %1
		Weir, Approach
DIS	SCIPLINE: Civil Engineers	NAME: RGL,DLS
	AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS
	LET WORKS - SPILLWAY WEIR, PROACH AND DISCHARGE CHANNELS	
Α.	APPROACH CHANNEL:	
	GENERAL CONDITION	Good
	LOOSE ROCK OVERHANGING CHANNEL	None
	TREES OVERHANGING CHANNEL	None
	FLOOR OF APPROACH CHANNEL	Lined with stone
в.	WEIR AND TRAINING WALLS:	
	GENERAL CONDITION OF CONCRETE	Good
	RUST OR STAINING	None observed
	SPALLING	Some spalling of upstream training wall below water.
	ANY VISIBLE REINFORCING	None observed
	ANY SEEPAGE OR EFFLORESCENCE	Possible scepage at right end of weir between concrete and stone masonry.
	DRAIN HOLES	N/A
ς.	DISCHARGE CHANNEL:	
	GENERAL CONDITION	Fair; flows into 48" RCP culvert, then to natural streambed
	LOOSE ROCK OVERHANGING CHANNEL	Some loose rock on channel slopes.
	TREES OVERHANGING CHANNEL	Some trees overhanging channel.
	FLOOR OF CHANNEL	Gravel and cobbles
	OTHER OBSTRUCTIONS	Remains of small dam several hundred feet downstream.


OTHER: Garions placed inside training walls and downstream of spillway in good condition.


APPENDIX B


ENGINEERING DATA




## PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR











#### LIST OF REFERENCES


References listed below, as well as considerable additional correspondence and construction photographs, are located at the Connecticut Water Company, 93 West Main Street, Clinton, Connecticut 06413, and the Department of Environmental Protection, Water and Related Resources Unit, State Office Building, Hartford, Connecticut 06115.


- Plans and Specifications, Plymouth Reservoir Dam Repairs, by Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., July 21, 1977.
- Memo from J. R. McQueen, Thomaston Reservoir Gatchouse, September 7, 1977.
- Flood routing computations, Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., August 5, 1976.
- 4. "Investigation of Seepage and General Condition of Plymouth Reservoir Dam", Letter Report to William F. Guillaume from Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., August 19, 1975.
- 5. Boring Logs, Associated Boring Company, Inc., Plymouth Reservoir, Plymouth Connecticut, June 9 through June 20, 1975.
- 6. Letter inspection report, Plymouth Reservoir, Plymouth, Connecticut, S. E. Minor and Company, Inc., to Victor Galgowski, Superintendent of Dam Maintenance, Water and Related Resources, July 15, 1974.
- 7. Stage-Capacity Curve, Thomaston Reservoir, The Henry Souther Engineering Company, December 1948.
- 8. Sketches, Dam and Gatehouse, The Henry Souther Engineer Company, December 6, 1932.


A GOVERNMENT
































CEPAUT DUNN \_

## VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST FOR DAMS

## The Connecticut Water Company

Dam Name: FLYMOUTH RESERVOIR Inspection Date: APRIL 28, 1981

Present at Inspection: Z. BAILL REGEON, R. HRESTAD, R.LITKE, D.SMITH

Reservoir Level: FULL

General condition of slopes or dam faces: 6000 Any evidence of erosion on upstream face? 1/0

On downstream face? NO

Any unwanted tree growth?

NO

Any animal burrows in slopes?

Any notable earth movements? NO

Any spongy spots or noticeable seepage? YES - 40 SOUTH OF HELCO POLE #131 AND 15 RT. APPROX ZO'LONG X8' WIDE FREE SATURATED TO SURFACE NO WATER MONING

Spillway condition: VERY GOOD

Spillway Obstructions: NONE

Tail Race Conditions: GOOD

Downstream obstructions or undermining of spillway or splash pad: NOWE

Comments or recommendations:

O REPAIR I OBSERVATION WELL THAT HAS BEEN BROKEN AND IS STILL VISIBLE AT GROUND SURFACE, (AT TOP OF EMBRNEMENT OPP. POLE #131. REPLACE CAP ON OB, 9 (2) CHECK WET AREA CAREFULLY AT NEXT MONTHLY

INSPECTION. NOTE ANY CHANGES . LOOK FOR EVIDENCE OF ANY WATER MOVEMENT

Reviewed by:

The Talks date 4/28/81

Distribution: KWK

## INTER OFFI T MEMO - THE CONECTICUT WATTR COMPANY

SUBJECT:	Harriston Reservair, Gatehouse	H OSM	IJ	MacKENZIE	[ ]
		BURRILL	נו	SHAW	[]
C FE:	Sept. 7, 1977	CIARCIA	IJ	STEWART	13
•		DUNN	<b>13</b> :	TARNOWICZ	13
FDM: J. R. McQueen	J. R. McQueen	GUILLAUME	17		[]
	KEL <b>L\$</b>			[]	
		, LAFLAMME			13

On August 29, 1977 Bill Dunn reported small fish about 1/8" in diameter showing up at the Altair Company meter and also at the treated tap at the chlorination station. Roland reported many small minnows in and around the gatehouse with some downstream of the last screen. Advised chlorination with HTH around gatchouse and at intake levels to drive fish away and to remove fish in gate house with dip net if possible. I examined the screen system the 30th with Bill and Roland. Chlorination seemed to be keeping most of the fish away, but a few were still present in the gate house. The first two sets of screens, one coarse and one fine, were not down all the way. Reason unknown. The third set, also fine, appeared down all the way, but the mesh size, approximately 1/6", would still allow the small minnows to go through. Bill didn't want to remove the screens at this time for fear of not being able to get any of the three back into place thus making the situation worse than it was. I agreed. I scheduled a diver for Sunday, Sept. 4, (when we knew there would be a reverse flow from the well) to do whatever was required to get the screens back into their full closed positions. Also asked Bill to pick up enough vinyl or fiberglass window screen to cover one set of fine screens as well. We removed all screens on the 4th, cleaned and installed the window screen on the third set. The diver inspected the exterior and the interior of the gate house. The attached sketches are my interpretation of the diver's observations. In general, the diver (Ron Shvonski) found the gate house in sound structural condition with only slight deterioration of the masonry above the water line. The bottom of the gate house contained a large amount of silt and fine gravel (0.5 to 1 mm) that prevented the screens from closing. Most of this material was removed so that all screens could be properly reinstalled. The coarse set will not be pulled routinely in the hope it will act as a gravel stop for the other two sets of screens. The remaining screens will be examined weekly. The minnows should be large enough in a few weeks so they won't be able to get through even the first set of screens. This should eliminate the fish problem at least for the time being.

Other problems and questions that still remain are as follows:

1.) The channel approaching the upper intake is lined with fine sand and gravels similar to that found inside the gate house. Entrance velocities are apparently great enough to sweep this material into the structure and accumulate

on the bottom. This condition can be expected to continue.

- 2.) The lower intake with centerline approximately 20 feet below spillway is completely plugged with silt and gravel. The valve position is unknown. The center intake approximately 15 feet below spillway is a crack open. The upper intake approximately 9 feet below spillway is wide open. This valve is believed to have been last operated by W.K.M. at the time the Company was purchased. All valves are believed to be 8° MRS hub type gates with operating rods extended through the floor and wheels attached. I'm afraid to operate any of them.
- 3.) There is a single 8" outlet pipe located approximately 20 feet below spillway. The diver confirmed a reverse flow here at a time when we knew well water was reaching the chlorination station. Therefore, this pipe must be the active intake to the system.
- 4.) There are known to be two pipes at the toe of the dam slope one leading to the system and one to the brook. How the brook pipe is connected to the reservoir or the gatehouse is unknown.

I'd like to discuss these problems and questions and how they might relate to the present dam reconstruction as well as future treatment plant thinking with you soon.

JRM/be

att.

50 Staniford Street Rostor Massachusetts 02114 617 523-1900 TWX 710 321 6365 Cable Address IMETEDD Boston

August 5, 1976

J-4177

Mr. William F. Guillaume Vice President - Operations The Connecticut Water Company 93 West Main Street Clinton, Connecticut 06413

Dear Mr. Guillaume:

Enclosed please find copies of our calculations for a flood-routing through Plymouth Reservoir in Thomaston, Connecticut, as requested in your telephone conversation with Mr. Moody and your letter of July 23, 1976.

The Kennison-Colby Rare Flood method was used to construct the inflow hydrograph for the design storm. The Rare Flood would have a probable frequency of greater than 100 years. The flood routing was done graphically with a two hour interval used for each incremental calculation.

The modified principal spillway and emergency spillway were found to be just capable of passing flood without the dam being overtopped. However, according to our graphical solution, there would be zero freeboard, at the end of the peak two hour interval. An integral solution by computer might result in a small (say 0.1 ft) freeboard during the peak period of the flood. The reservoir was assumed to be at full capacity at the start of the flood. All outflow was assumed to be discharged over the spillways, and none through the 12-inch outlet pipe. Use of the latter would result in some factor of safety.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

METCALF & EDDY\_INC

Arthur D. Moody

Project Manager

JJP/dc Encs.

RECEIVED TO LOCAL

THE CINC THOMAS INT. DAME LAN

```
Subject FLOOD ROUTICIA COMPAND BY TRUERS DIV. 7-30-76

Detail PLANIANT TERRAD HREAS CHO BY ALTOCOMY Date 1-4-76

(FROM U.S.G.S.)
```

DRAINAGE AREA!

$$\begin{array}{c}
0000 \\
9580 \\
385.740
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
4.20 \\
9.20 \\
9.603 \\
9.603 \\
9.4.7
\end{array}$$

NORMAL WATER SURFACE: (EL 692)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 1932 \\
 1970 \\
 7
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 0.38 \\
 \hline
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 0.385 \\
 \hline
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 0.385 \\
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 0.385 \\
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 0.384 \\
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \end{array}$$

AREA WITHIN 700 CONTOUR

4146

4201

4755

0.54

0.545

5003 AC-

AREA OF SWAMPS

$$21757$$

$$2180 \begin{cases} 0.05 \\ 0.05 \end{cases} 0.05 SQIN = \frac{4.59AC}{17.44AC}$$

= 4.52 % OF DRAWALLE AREA METCALF & EDDY, ENGINEERS

Subject FLO.  Detail ELFVA	OD KOUT	u) y Packe	nct is	1Pine H. Mod	20%_	Date 5 6	9-26 1-26
AREA	WITHIN	700 con	TOUR		50.0	3	
**	1.	692		_	35.3	34	
5.6.5.)	÷ 8f+	ELEY =	1.84 A	c/f+ E	14.6 LEV 0	69 ACRES	
ELEVATION (U.S.G.S.							
		0					
692 K	25 STORA	50 GE	75 ACRE-	FT	100	. 125	
	W	REA IITHIN ONTOUR	AVE. AREA (ACRES)		FFER.	INCREM. STORALE (ACRE-FT)	CUMULA STORAGE (ACTFT)
EL 69	•	5.34 Z	36.26	× 1	1 -	36.26	
EL 69	3 3	7.18 } 9.02 }	38,1	× 1	· =	38.1	74.36
EL 69		10.86	3994	× 1	2	39.9¥	

Subject FLOOD POPTING Compid By POUTES Day 3-2-76.
Detail GEOGRAPHICAL CENTRE CKO By Hillordy Day 2.4-16.

L=900 f+

(DISTANCE FROM CENTER

OF GRAVITY TO RES.

BY STREAM BEL)

790.62

AVE ELEV: 88,550

DETERMINATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL CENTER OF D.A. (CENTER OF GRAVITY)



	Subject	FLO	OOD	POUT	1136		Compad I	JP	mres a M	Date	8-3	-76
	Detail .	<u> </u>	A	B		\	'( k d Hy _	F	ر کی	Date	I	
	1		-	-	-	<u> </u>		<b>—</b> .		_		,
			-	_			880	880	885	890	_	2
	.3		_	_			8.70	860	870	930	930	3
	4	• •	-	-	<u> </u>	· - ·	85°	840	845	905	920	4
	5	• •	-:	-	;:	885	830	8/0	850	890		5
	6		<b>—</b> :	-	870	880	800	810	860	_		6
	7.			-	870	900	785	810	870			7
	8			830	870	835	780	815	850			8
	9	· · ·	_	810	845	79.0	775	815	850	880	-	9
8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	10	750	800	805	800	760	785	820	860	870	<u> </u>	10
ENGIN	111.	720	790	810	810	770	795	8/0	860	_	•	11
EDDY.	12		730	800	800	750	. 795	·	-	-		12
ALF &	13		692	735	740	725	785	-	_	_		/3
METC.	14		692	700	700	715	775	780	-	_	-	14
	15		700	692	692	720	775	-			<u>.</u>	15
	16	•	720	692	692	715	800	_		· —		16
	-17	1 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	740	695	692	700	790		<u>-</u>	_	-:	17
	.18	•	755	715	692	692	755	776		_		18
	.19		760	740	7/6	692	745	770		· <del></del>		19
	Zo	_ • = # = { • = • •	760	760	730	720	750	-:				20
	21	•	<b> </b>	810	750	760	-:		_	-		21
	22			-	780	770			-		-:	22
 			A	B	C	<b>D</b> .	E.	F	4	[H]	I	
!		1470	8139 (11)	10,594	13,043	(18)	9 15120 (19)	10,590 (12)	100	5365 (6)	(Z)	B-20

Subject FLOOD	HOUTH 6	Compid By Pauers	
Detail AVE EL	EV. OF D.A.	Ckd By	Date
	*	. 85 085 966 835 790	7.7.7 7.7.7 5.4.7 5.0.0
•	& 0 0 7.9 0 7.3 0 6.9 2 6.9 2	7.60 7.70 7.50 7.75 7.15 7.70 7.00	6.7 0 6.5 0 6.6 0 6.6 0 7.6 0 3.6 0 0 8
	7.00 7.20 7.40 7.55 7.60 7.60 3.1.20 %	697 220 220 260 270 132796	1 9 6 1 4 9 6 1 4 9 6 1 4 9 6 1 4 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	830 810 810 8010 8010 8010 8010 8010 801	975306378998777095 97530637899877095 777777787	1
	870 870 870 840 840 840 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 740 7	7.7	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
·	7.8 0 1.3 0.4 3 *	7.7 ° ; 3-21 10 29 0 *	

Subject FLOOD FOUTING Compad By AFRICACLY Date 5-116

Detail DESIGN FLOOD Cha By A Modely Date 5-9-16

KENNISON COLBY FORMULA (RAKE FLOOD)

PEAK FLOW Q = (0.0595 S1.5 + 342) x Mo.95

S= E1 790.62 - 692 = 97.38 f+ -

51.5 = 961 V

M = 0.603 sq mi, M°.95 = 0.618.

L= 900 ft = 0.17mi, 20.7 = 0.290~

 $Q = (0.0595 \times 961 + 342) \frac{0.618}{0.290}$ 

= 850 cfs PEAK FLOW

HYDROGRAPH (RARE FLOOD)

DEPTH OF RUNDEF - INCHES = D = 8.9 - 0.49 + 0.001E

A = WATER SURFACE EXPRESSED AS % OF DRAMAGE AREA

4.52% V \* ABOVE RESERVOIR V

E: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AVI. EL. OF D.A AND EL. 800 fi

(EL 792-800) - NEGL.
DISREGARD

D = 8.9 - [(0.4)(4.52)] +0 = 7.09 INCHES ~

METCALF & EDDY, ENGINEERS

	•		Chid By AMCCI		
INTERVAL HRS	RUH OFF 0/0D	RUN OFF INCHES	RATE OF RUN C	Per :	AVE FLOW Cfs
0-6	2	0.14	x (5,280) x	60×60×6	9
.6-12	. 3	0,21		1	14
12-18	5	0.35			. 23
18-24	8	0.57	-		37
24-30	10	0.7/			46
30-36	20	1.42			92
36-42	40	z,84			184
42.48	10	0.71			46
48-54	2	0.14			9
	100	7.09	<b>V</b>	<b>∀</b> 	
= • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		• = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
					i
				- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	
			•		
' '				,	

S D	ubject letail	_ <u></u>	EL EL	12H R		701	S	01-V	/ , ,						y =1 <u>A</u>							۲ : <u>د</u>		76		
-			: ••	-	1	•	. ,	•	•		: •	· †	:			•			:			!				
				A	CT+	IE.	DIA	PILL PISC CRA PER	НА E -	RO FI	 د		(	Di ac	SPI SCH RE- R 3	AR.	.4 E r			1		-	• • •		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			1	•	0.7			-+ 	1,6	,		•			0.	<b>.</b>		-	:				: . : .			
					0.4			•	4,6 8.6			•			2.3 4.		· ·		:						•	
-			-		1.0	<u>:</u> _		7.	3.6 9.6	7		•			6.8		· - ·						• - •		•	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
-				·	1.2	• =		2	6.	76					13.3	38	•			• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		- <del> </del>			•	
		-			1.4	•		4.	4. e	5					17, 21.9				. 4				· ·	:		
_					1.9			•	1.4	Ĺ					27.2 36.,				•						•	
							••																	:		
												-	-	-								-	;; ! : : !		·	A Section
		_						-											-			-				
				·												-								:		
					-	-						24				-	•	-		-	-		•	•		
		1.	1			İ	LJ.			\.	- D	<b>~</b> 4	_]		i	! -	l1	. 1	. !	1		. ! .		•	•	•

5

water to be the second second

		STEP	HOURS FROM START	INSTANTANEOUS RATE OF ! INFLOW, I	SUM OF DISCHARGES START & EMD	AVERNGE INFLOW CFS AC-FT	1	Drivers is AT END OF MATERIA S-FS
	-		OF FLOOD	(cfs)	T1 + T =	3.5 .57	692,01	/
		2	4	8	15	7.5 1.24	692.05	2;
٠		3	6	10	18	9.0 1.49	692.075	4
		4	- &	12	22,	11.0 1.82	692.1	5
		5		15	27	13.5 2.23	692.14	6
		6	12.	18	33	16.5 2.73	692.19	10
		7	14	21	39	19,5 3,22	692.24	/3
8		8	16	25	46	23.0 3.8	692.78	16
NGINEE	-	9	18	29	54	27.0 4.46		
ооγ. ∈		/0	20	34	63	31.5 5.2	692,36	. [
LF & E	-	<b>"</b>	. 22	40	74	37,0 6.11	692.41	30
METCA		12	24	46	86	43.0 7.1.	692,46	35
_	L	/3	26	55	101	50.5 8.34	692.525	
		14	. 28.	63	118	59.0 9.74 69.0 11.4	692.64	50
		./5.	30	90	165	825 13.63		• 1
		-  6    	32.	110	200	100.0 16.52		į
			36	140	250	125.0 20.65		j
		19	38	400	540	270 44.6	j	2.16
		20	40	400	800		693.9	262
		21	42	//0	510		693.65	283
		22,	44	70	190		673.13	146
į		23	46		25/30	65 10.7	692.875	95

EPF HBLF 3 FO

			21 7/11	1 621	\[     \cdot \cd	8.4.1	
	1.			<u> </u>   Tr			1
	1 3				<u> </u>		
		3					
!				***			L. L.
				De.			700 700
!	-				The same		0.00
						المراسية المراسية	14 10 ST
	<u></u>						3 3 3
 							E IN
							5
0							00 (5)
		1-1-14					
			-		0,-		
			111			70	
4				72			
772			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	7			
50	-						
6							
E (1) 2							
25							
4						1	
0 70 (ACRE+FT		2400	P				
		DAYE PAGE	FLOOT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
- 60		100 NO 10	D		<b>)</b>	8	
	$\rightarrow 1$ , $\tau$	7 20 7	2			81	
-6		(7 7 00)	Tua				
6		PLYMOUTH RES. CONN WAT CO. J POWERS 8-4-76 PAGE 14 OF 15	FLOOD ROUTING				8 1
160					2		
							5

	LOOD POUTING COM	6, St. 11775 the _2 f f // //
900		
		850 ets PEAK
		9
800		
	# · · · · ·       · · · ·     · · · · ·	and the second second
700		
1		
600		
		INFLOW
		HYDROGRAPH
500		
5 00 · · ·		
<i>t</i> .		
. , . ,		
400		
. 3 .		
7		
300		OUTFLOW?
		HYDROGEAP
•		
200 1		
100		
1		
0		
	0 10 20	30 40 50 60
	TIME - HOURS	

### Metcalf & Eddy, Inc. | Engineers & Planners

Statler Building Boston, Massachusetts 02116 (617)423 5600 TWX 710 321-6365 Cabre METEDO BOSTON

August 19, 1975

J-4177

Mr. William F. Guillaume Vice President, Operations The Thomaston Water Company General Offices West Main Street Clinton, Connecticut 06413

Dear Mr. Guillaume:

An investigation of the seepage and general condition of the Plymouth Reservoir Dam, Plymouth, Connecticut has been completed and our findings and recommendations presented herein. This work was undertaken in accordance with our proposal dated May 15, 1975 and your Purchase Order No. 3722G dated May 20, 1975, in response to the request by the State of Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection dated September 3, 1974.

#### History

The Thomaston Dam was designed by William B. Rider, hydraulic engineer, in 1880. Review of the appropriate sections of the contract documents provided the following information on the original dam:

- 1. The embankment was to be 15 feet wide at the top with a slope of two to one on both sides.
- 2. Through the entire length of the embankment a cemented wall of rubble masonry was to be constructed.

- 3. The ground surface beneath the wall and the embankment was to be thoroughly cleaned of all muck,
  porous materials or other deleterious substances.
  (Note: a later sketch indicated the bottom of the
  core wall was set 5 feet below grade.)
- 4. The spillway was to be constructed of shingled masonry laid up dry in the form of steps, with each layer of stone covered at least three-fourths of its length by the layer above.
- 5. The spillway wing walls were to be 5-foot thick bonded masonry extending across the entire dam section.
- 6. The embankment was to be constructed by placing puddle (soil wet of optimum moisture content) of selected gravel (maximum size 2 inches) and clay in horizontal layers not exceeding 6 inches in thickness. Each layer was to set until firm and stiff before being harrowed and watered prior to the application of the next layer.
- 7. The entire surface of the embankment of the upstream slope was to be paved with rip-rap of at least 12 inches in thickness.

The dam was apparently constructed during 1880 and 1881. A check of the final quantities against the design configuration was made and indicates close agreement.

In 1910 the dam was raised 16 inches and the embankment strengthened. In 1921 additional work involving rip-rap on the dam was performed. It is not known what work was actually performed on the dam under these two contracts.

#### Investigation

To investigate the condition within the present structure, a program of soil sampling and installation of piezometers was undertaken. The field work was performed by Associated Boring Company, Inc. of Naugatuck, Connecticut under contract to the Thomaston Water Company and inspected by geologist A. Scott Nagle of Metcalf & Eddy.

The subsurface investigation included 10 borings across the dam cross-section approximately 50 feet south of the spillway, and one boring 20 feet north of the spillway just downstream of the axis of the dam. Each boring was sampled at the ground surface and at 5 foot intervals. At a predetermined depth, the hole was terminated and a piezometer installed to establish the piezometric heads at specific locations within the dam. After evaluation of the soil boring results and piezometer data, six additional shallow piezometers were installed in hand auger holes to determine the phreatic surface beneath the surface of the downstream slope of the embankment.

Figure 1 shows a plan of the dam and the location of the various borings. The boring logs prepared by Associated Boring Company are attached at the end of this letter and give the drillers' description of the soil encountered.

Laboratory tests were run on several samples. The results are presented in the following table:

	Sampl Sampl	e Depth	Liquid	Plastic		Unified soil classification group symbol
W-4	3	10-11 1/2	43.7	7.4	37	ML
W-4	5	20-21 1/2	28.5	2.6	22.3	ML
W-5	Ц	15-16 1/2	nonpla	astic	-	ML
W-7	2	5-6 1/2	39	9.4	-	ML

In general, the embankment material is classified as brown to dark brown inorganic silt and very fine sands with slight plasticity and traces of medium to coarse sand and fine gravel. The underlying material is a residual soil, or rock decomposing in place which becomes more rock-like in structure and strength with increasing depth.

The blow counts within the embankment are very low, at about two blows per foot but range down to one blow per foot indicating the material to be very loose or very soft. A slightly plastic silt of this type would normally be expected to have a drained angle of internal friction of about 26 degrees plus a cohesive strength of several hundred pounds per square foot. In an undrained condition, the angle of internal friction would be decreased, possibly to the order of 5 to 10 degrees with the cohesion remaining unchanged. The dry unit weight should be about 80 pounds per cubic foot and the saturated unit weight about 112 pounds per cubic foot.

4

Mr. William F. Guillaume August 19, 1975

Figure 2 is a section through the dam showing the soil condition and blow counts encountered. The configuration of the dam slopes was determined by actual measurements extending about 85 feet on either side of the dam center line. Note that the downstream slope plots about 2-1/4 to 1 while the upstream slope plots about 3 to 1. It is suspected that during either the 1910 or 1921 work on the dam the upstream face was flattened to its present slope.

#### Flow Analysis

The piezometers were read after completion and at periodic intervals thereafter to assure that an equilibrium condition had been reached. Using data taken July 1, 1975, equipotential lines have been superimposed on the dam section and are presented in Figure 3.

Readings indicate only a 2.7 foot drop in head between piezometer W-1 and W-3 indicating a virtually unimpeded flow through the core wall. The spacing of the equipotential lines indicates some variability of the embankment permeability -- being least permeable in the embankment half just downstream of the core wall, and becoming more permeable in the embankment half near the toe.

Based on the head differential of about 2 feet between the piezometers at mid slope and the toe, a distance of about 16 feet, an exit gradient of 0.13 is calculated. For a silty soil flow out through the embankment slope could be sufficient to dislodge soil particles and permit deterioration of the dam.

Summarizing, the core wall is leaking and permitting seepage to exit on the downstream slope of the dam, a condition that can cause erosion of the embankment.

#### Stability Analysis

An analysis was performed to determine the stability of the embankment against rotational shear failure. It was concluded that any attempt to obtain undisturbed soil samples for triaxial shear testing in the laboratory to determine soil strengths would be prohibitively expensive, if indeed possible. Loose fine soils and silts are very difficult to sample, transport and test without causing some disturbance to the soil structure, thus destroying the properties to be tested.

Therefore, analyses were run to determine the factor of safety using several assumed soil properties and the result compared with the probable soil strengths.

Initially the stability was investigated by varying the angle of internal friction and then by adding cohesion. Based on these analyses, it is felt that the dam with a full reservoir has a safety factor of about 1.4 against a deep rotational failure of the downstream slope using an angle of interval friction of 26 degrees and a cohesion of 100 pounds per square foot. Lowering the reservoirs appears to improve the safety factor by 0.1 for each 2 feet of drawdown.

Because of the very loose condition of the embankment soil, there is a concern of what would happen should any vibration, such as resulting from an earthquake, local blasting or similar event, occur. Typically, a loose soil will tend to densify when vibration occurs thus causing liquifaction, a temporary loss of intergranular friction and corresponding increase in pore water pressure. In an undrained condition using an angle of internal friction of 10 degrees and a cohesion of 100 pounds per square foot, the downstream embankment of the dam has a safety factor of less than 1.

Summarizing, the condition of the dam embankment under static conditions using assumed soil values is satisfactory. However, vibratory disturbance could result in failure of the downstream embankment.

#### Recommendations

It is necessary to intercept and eliminate seepage from the downstream toe of the dam and to improve the strength of the downstream slope to reduce the possibility of failure from dynamic forces.

To accomplish both goals it is recommended that a new toe drain be installed; the outer 3 feet of the existing embankment be removed; the top downstream of the core wall be excavated to elevation 94, and that the removed material be replaced with compacted granular material and a new slope of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical be constructed. To permit the slope flattening, gabions should be placed parallel to the road where the new slope will extend beyond the property line.

Mr. William F. Guillaume August 19, 1975

The toe drain should consist of a 6-inch diameter perforate pipe with filter envelopes of 3/4-inch course aggregate and concrete sand to prevent any migration of the protected soil. The invert of the toe drain should extend about 1 foot below the overburden soil into the denser decomposed rock or residual soil. The gabions should be founded directly on the decomposed rock and have a backward rake of 1 horizontal to 6 vertical. Figure 4 shows a typical section for the slope with the gabions and without.

By installing the underdrain and gabion, starting at the spillway, in short sections and completing back to original grade prior to any slope excavation, it is our opinion that the work can be performed with the reservoir lowered about 8 inches by removing the concrete cap along the spillway crest. Prior to excavating embankment material, a period of time - say several weeks - should be allowed to permit drainage and lowering of the phreatic surface. This can be field checked with well points pushed into the embankment.

All work performed on the dam should be performed under the immediate close supervision of a qualified engineer. It is necessary that the work be watched closely for evidence of excessive leakage, piping, slumping, sliding, etc., and that promp action be taken to stop the condition should it develop. It is recommended that several loads of pervious material be stockpiled adjacent to the work area at all times to cover or push over a questionable condition should it occur.

The new filters and underdrains will effectively lower the phreatic surface and lesson the chance for liquification to occur under vibration loadings. In addition, the new granular fill will increase the effective stress between soil particles thus providing greater strength, and at the same time, because of the flatter slope, reduce the shearing stresses.

Should you have questions concerning our findings or recommendations, or if you wish to discuss any aspect further, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

METCALF & EDDY, INC.

Vice President

EBM: jfg

Att.




FIG. 3 DAM SECTION WITH EQUIPOTENTIAL LINES




FIG 4 RECOMMENDED REHABILITATION




FIG. 2 DAM SECTION SOFT. SOUTH OF SPILLWAY

Associated
Borings
Company, Inc.

119 MARGARET CIRCLE, NAUGATUCK, CONN. C6770 AREA CODE (203) 729-5435

PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR

PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUT.

ADUA HE E	TUCK, CONN. D6770	TEST EC	RING RI	EPORT	1	ENT <u>Жакаайй</u> 4 газу, Та	ring san	• • • •
	BORING NO. 1 LINE & STA. OFFSET GR. ELEV. DATE 6-15-75				LI O G	ORING NO?  NE & STA  PERSET  R. ELEV  ATE5-17-75		
	M.Lloret A.Daddona A STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST.	BLOWS PER 4" B		A	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST.	BLOWS PER 6" B
17	Torsoil  Gr. M-F Silty Sand,  Some F. Grav., Root  Fibres.	Loose Moist Rec:6"	1-1	012		Tonsoil  Br. Silt, Tr.F.Sand,  Tr.F.Grav., Tr. Decomp.  Rock, Root Fibres.	Loose Moist Rec:6"	2-2
10	Br. M-F Silty Sand, Tr	Loose Wet Rec:0"	1-1 1 Fush			"	Loose Wet Rec:0"	1-1 1
ְוַלַ	F. Grav.,,Tr. Decomp. Rock,Root Fibres.  End of Boring at 11'5	Loose Wet Rec:6"	1-1	1610 1615 1710		Gray Silt, Some f. Gray. Tr. Decom. Fools, Dark Br. Silt	Loose  Yet  Rec:18"	1-1
(	GNO -4'0 at "0" Hrs.					Decomp. Rock	Loose Wet Rec:7"	1-1 ).
•	Remarks:  *Fushed from 6'5 to 8  **CH- Observation Wel					н	M.Comp. Wet Rec:13"	9-11 15
						II	Dense Moist Rec:6"	85-50/
				31.10		End of Boring at 31'0  GWO - 4'0 at "0" Hrs.		
						Remarks:	·o	
(						** Oil- Chservation We Augered to 31'0		
	1 COL, A Blows on Casing 2 COL, B Blows on 1%" Sample 3 HAMMER = 140 %; FALL 30 4 SAMPLER = O. D. SPLIT SPO	••		J B~38		FIELD — " CONTENT  AND — 40 to 50'  SOME — 10 to 40'	i c	!

B-38

5 GWO = GROUND WATER OBSERVATIONS

AND - 40 to 50% SOME - 10 to 40%
TRACE - 0 to 10%

119 M		ET CIRCLE , CONN. 06770 -5435	TEST BO	RINS RE	FORT	PR CL	ou. Plymouth Reservator	,Dom <u>o</u> ut	
<u> </u>	LIN OF GR	PRING NO. 3 NE & STA FSET I. ELEV				LI O G	ORING NOL INE & STA DFFSET GR. ELEV		•
	M. 1	Lioret Daddona STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST.	BLOWS PER 6"		Ð	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST,	BLOWS PER 6" B
012		Pangai 1	Locse		012		Torsoil	Loose	1-2
1.15		Br. M-F Sand, Porte F. Grav., Tr. Decomp. Rock, Root Fibres.	Moist Rec: 4"	2	l: 'C		Br. N-A Sand, Tr. F. Grav., Tr. Mica, Rock Fracs. Dark Gray Clarey Filt	Moist Rec:3"	L-3
		Tr. F. Sand, Tr. Cobble Tr. Rock Frags, Tr. Rock Fibres, Slightly Org.	Loose		n		Tr. F. Sand, Tr. De- comp. Rock, Tr. Roct Fibres, Micacious.	Loose Wet Rec:14"	1-1
<u>n 5</u>		End of Poring at 11'5	Ioose Moist Rec:5"	17-3 5	ı		tt	Loose Wet Rec:13"	1-1
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0:10 -5'5 at "0" Hrs			1810		(Some Decomp. Rock)	M. Comp.	8-? 3
(							Gray F. Silty Sand, Some F. Grav., Micacious.	M. Comp. Moist Rec: Ru	10-3 12
					2ا: ٥٠		Gray F. Silty Sand, Some F. Grav.& Decemb		30=35
				-			Rock, Rock Frags.	Moist Rec:11"	36
							11	D <sub>ense</sub> Moist Rec:10"	20-32 70
					3515		Refusal at 35'5	Dense 'oist Rec:6"	90/6"
		· <u>-</u>					End of Poring at 35'5		,

FIELD - % CONTENT

Installed Cd at 31:10

- 40 to 50'; AND

SOME - 10 to 40";

<sup>1</sup> COL. A Clows on Casing

 <sup>2</sup> COL. B Blows on 1%" Sampler (I.D.)
 3 HAMIMER = 140 N; FALL 30"

<sup>4</sup> SAMPLER = O. D. SPLIT SPOON

880 AL :	DCIATED BORINGS CO., INC. IARGARET CIRCLE ATUCK, CONN. 06770 IE 729-5435	TEST E	ORING REPORT	L	Out. Plymouth Escentsis,		
	BORING NO. 5 LINE & STA. OFFSET GR. ELEV. DATE 6-09-75			LI O G	DRING NO.  NE & STA.  FESET		
	A STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST.	BLOWS PER 4"	A	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DEHSITY OR CONSIST.	BLOWS PER 6" B
112 -	Densit  2r. M-P Silty Sand,  Some Dark Br. Silt,T  P. Grav,Tr. Cobbles,  Tr.Root Fibres.	Loose Moist Rec:6"	1-1		Minstalled C' at 2315  Remarks:  Drill Time Per Ft. is  shown in Column A		
ـ ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	Silt, Some Decorp. Rock Tr.F. Grav., Root Fibre	<,	2-1		•		
<b>13!</b> ೧_	Dark Br. F. Sand, Some	Loose Moist Rec:14	1-1 2				<u>-</u> .
17' _	Silt,Tr. F. Grav.,Tr. Decomp.Rock,Rock Frag Gray H-F Sand,Some Silt,Some Decomp.Rock	I cose Wet Rec:?"	1-2				
<u>231</u> ^_	Tr.F.Grav.  Gray Br. M-F Sand.Tr.	M. Comp Wet Rec:7"	10-13 14				
2010	Silt, Tr. F Grav., Tr. Decomp. Rock, Cobbles, Cemented	V.Comp. Moist Rec:11	15-25 30				
2910 301	(Some Decomposed wook) Decomposed wook	Donse Moist Rec:12"	23-23 L5				· <b>-</b>
<u>งราว</u> <u>เดา</u>	Jecomposed Mica Schis  w/quartzite Run #1:from 35'0 to L Recovery: L"	Rec:0"	50/0"		-	•	
<u>:0'</u>	End of Boring at 1:0'0	1 1					
	GNO -8'0 at "0" Hrs. -7'0 at 2h Hrs.						

1 COL, A Blows on Casing

FIELD -- CONTENT VND VND - 40 to 50%

<sup>2</sup> COL, B Blows on 13/8" Sampler (I.D.)
3. HAMMER = 140 + FALL 30"
4 SAMPLED OF SPLIT STOCK!

19 4A 19 4A 14 1A	- A 1 1 5 11 A R 1 11 C K 1 7 2 Y	DECAMBLE CO, DC., DC., ET CORELE, COMP. DG770	TEST EC	Ring ri	EPORT	PRO CL1	py Plynous Par Meteo	bh Benervoir Af A Eder,	,jlyncu: Proitee :	·., · · · ·
•	LI' Of GR	ORING NO. 5 NE & STA. FISET_ R. ELEV. ATE 6-09-75	DENSITY	<b>BLOWS</b>		LI O Gl	NE & STA FFSET R. ELEV		DEHSTLY	<b>B1 C/%·′S</b> P£R o''
	Α	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	OR COMSIST.	PER 4"		Α	STRATUM	DESCRIPTION	OR CONSIST.	В
<u> </u>		Transpil  Br. M-F Silty Sand,  Some Dark Br. Silt, Tr.  F. Grav, Tr. Cobbles,  Tr. Moot Fibres.	Loose Moist Rec:6"	1-1		<u> </u>	<i>∃emarks:</i> Drill Ti	d <u>C' at 2315</u> me Per Ft. i Column A		
71′	-		Loose	2-1					.	
		Dark Br. F. Sand, Dome Silt, Some Decomp. Rock, Tr.F. Grav., Root Fibres	Rec:h" Loose Moist	1-1				,		
13!^ 17! .		Dark Br. F. Sand, Some Silt, Tr. F. Grav., Tr. Decomp. Rock, Rock Frags	Rec:14"	1-2 8			·			
( ,		Gray H-7 Sand, Some Silt, Some Decomp. Rock, Tr.F.Grav.	Rec:9" M.Comp.							
231-		Gray Br. M-F Sand, Tr.	Wet Rec:7"	1/4						
		Silt, Tr.F Grav., Tr. Decomp. Rock, Cobbles, Cemented	V.Comp. Moist Rec:11	30						_
<u>301</u> 0.		(Some Decomposed wook) Decomposed wook	Dense	23-33 L5						
			Moist Rec:12"	ĿÞ				•		
<u>अद्राठ</u>	3 2 3	Decomposed Nica Schist w/quartzite Run #1:from 35'0 to LO	Rec:0"	50/0"						

0:10 -8:0 at "0" Hrs. -7:0 at 2h Hrs. 1 COL, A Blows on Casing


:01


2 COL, B Blows on 13/3" Sampler (I.D.)
 3 HAMMER = 140 %, FALL 30"

End of Boring at 1:010

B-41

FIELD - % CONTENT AND - 40 to 50°;





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL PROBLEM OF TANDARD THE AREA

SEC.	21A7 A54A A14C+	ED EDWINGE CO., 1942. RET DIRCLE , CORR. 06770 , 5435	1 [2] T	Crins f	REPORT	PR	of Plysodth is enable, many percent a rem, r	(S.)go (S.) Tugʻitan m	n,
	LI	DRING NO 5  NE & STA  FFSET				LI O	ORING NO.  INE & STA.  OFFSET		
		R. ELEV ATE6-03-75					R. ELEV.		
	A	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST,	BLO4'S PER 4"		A	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DEMSITY OR CONSIST.	PLOWS PLP 6" B
<u>):</u>		Prescrit  Pr. M-F Silty Sand,  Some Dark Pr. Silt, Tr.  F. Grav, Tr. Cobbles,  Tr. Reot Fibres.	Loose Moist Rec:6"	1-1		*	Installed C! at 2215 Remarks: Drill Tire Per Ft. is shown in Column A		
<u> </u>		Dark Br. F. Sand, Some   Silt, Some Decomp. Rock, Tr.F. Grav., Root Fibres	Tet Rec:h"	1-1				•	
1319. 17. )		Dark Pr. F. Sand, Some Silt, Tr. F. Grav., Tr. Ducomp. Rock, Rock Frags	Moist Rec:14'	1-2			·	<u>.</u>	
<b>(</b>		Gray H-P Sand, Some Silt, Some Decomp. Rock, Tr.F. Grav.	M.Comp. Wet Rec:7"	10-13 11 <sub>1</sub>					·
910		Gray Dr. N-F Sand, Tr. Silt, Tr.F Grav., Tr. Decomp. Rock, Cobbles, Cemented	V.Comp. Moist Rec:11'	15-25 30					<u> </u>
<u>. ( ) </u>		Some Decomposed woold) Decomposed woold	Dense Moist Rec:12'	23-33 L5				•	
र <i>उ</i> इ <u>दा</u> ३	3	Decomposed Nica Schist w/quartzite Run fl:from 35'0 to ho Recovery: h"	Rec:0"	50/0"					
		End of Boring at 1:0'0  GHO -8'0 at "0" Hrs.  -7'0 at 2h Hrs.  DL. A Blows on Casing							

1 COL. A Blows on Casing
2 COL. B Blows on 1 1/4" Sampler (ID.)
3 .HAMMER = 140 \* , FALL 30"

B-42

FIELD -- "CONTENT AND - 40 to 500;

19 MANUARET CHROLE 190 STUCK, CONN. 06770 190 C 729:5435	TEST DORING REPORT				PROJECT CONTROL OF THE PROJECT OF TH				
BORING NO. 6  LINE & STA.  OFFSET  GR. ELEV.  DATE 6-20-75  T. Lloret J. Cody  A STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST.	BLOWS PER 4" B		LII O GI	DRING NO 7  NE & STA  FFSET  R. ELEV  ATE6-19-75  STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST.	BLOWS PERO" B		
2 Topsoil  11 Br. Mar Clayey Silty 21 Sand, Some Mar Grav. 21 32	Locse Moist Rec:0" *Rec:10	1-1 1-3	710 515	3 10 11 11 9	Tonsoil  Br. M-F Clayey Silty Sand, Tr. M-F Grav.	Locse Moist Rec:8"	1-4		
7 Gray M-F Clayey Silty G Sand, Some M-F Gray. 12 Gray M-F Sand & Gray 16 Some Silt, Tr. Clay. 18	Met.			$\frac{7}{12}$	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		3-1		
End of Boring at 12"		19~19 16	פינד.	7? 133 170	Decomposed wock	Conn. Moist Rec:12'	2? <b>-1</b> 7 15		
Emarks: Last sample ended at 11'5 but washed to 1 for CW installation.			19:2		End of Boring at 1912 GHO -610 at "0" Hrs.	1 1			
					Remarks: Drove casing to 14'0 then washed and drove with chopping bit to 19'2 where refusal was encountered. ** Observation Well				
			·		www.doservacion aeri	_			

B-43

1 COL, A Blows on Casing
2 COL, B Blows on 1%" Sampler (I.D.)
3 HAMMER = 140 %; FALL 30"
4 SAMPLER = O. D. SPLIT SPOON

FIELD - % CONTENT

AND - 40 to 50% SOME - 10 to 40%

\$19 M. \$1. Q.	ANDARET CHOCK ATUCK, CONN. 06779 8 729-5435	TEST BORING REPORT			CLIENT PRESIDE A Willy, Trainer,				
	BORING NO. 3 LINE & STA. OFFSET OR. ELEV. DATE 6-19-75 H. Lloret A. Daddona	DENSITY	PLOAZ		L	ORING NO. 9 INE & STA.  OFFSET  R. ELEV  A1E 6-19-75	рғизлу	<b>BLOWS</b>	
	A STRATUM DESCRIPTION	OR CONSIST.	B		A	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	OR CONSIST,	PER 6"	
112_	Fr. Silty Sand, Tr.F. Grav., Root Fibres	Loose Wet Rec:6"	1-1	013   		Er. Silty Sand, Pr.F. Grav., Root Fibres.	loose Vet Rec:6"	1-1 1	
<u> </u>	Gray Siliy F. Sand, Tr. F. Grav., Tr. Decomp.	M.Comp. Wet Rec:12"	13			Decemp. Rock	Comp. Moist Rec:18'	7-13 19	
	End of Boring at 6'5  CWO -1'O at "O" Hrs.			יונ [		11	Dense Moist Rec:14	29-37 1:2	
	Remarks:					End of Boring at 11'5  GWO -1'O at "O" Hrs.			
•				 		Remarks:			
				- - - - -					
				.   -					
	1 COL A Blows on Casing	.		-					

1 COL. A Blows on Casing
2 COL. B Blows on 13/8" Sampler (I.D.)
3 HAMMER == 140 4; FALL 30"
4 SAMPLER == O. D. SPLIT SPOON
5 CWO - GROUND WATER ORSERVATIONS

B-44

FIELD - " CONTENT AND - 40 to 50%

SOME - 10 to 40" TRACE -- 0 to 100

AL CONTROLS  TIM MANUAGET CHOIS  NA DATUCK, CONH. 06770  PH. NE 777:5435		TEST CORING REPORT				PROJ Programme in The Cath, Terre CLIENT Programme Addr. Tonithers				
	BORING NO. 10 LINE & STA. OFFSET  GR. ELEV DATE 6-19-75 .	·			LI O	DRING NO. 11  NE & STA.  FESET  R. ELEV.  ATE 6-20-75				
	M.I loret A. Daddona A. SIRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST.	PER 4" B		A	STRATUM DESCRIPTION	DENSITY OR CONSIST,	BLOWS		
01-	Torseil	Loose Let Res:9"	1-1/1	2" 912	ļ	Topsoil Br. M-f Silty Sand, Tr		2 <b>-</b> 2 3		
3'0_	Gray iF Silty Sand, Tr.F. Grav., Tr. Mica.			215		F.Grav., Tr. Decomp. Rock, Root Fibers, Tr. Mas.	Rec:6"			
610	Decomposed mock	V.Comp. Wet Rec:14"	25			Dark Br. F. Silty Sand, Tr. F. Grav., Tr. Decomp. Rock, Root Fibers, Slightly Org.	Loose Wet Rec:0" Loose	1-1		
12 5		V.Comp. Moist	23-31 37	7010		(Hock Frace, Some Decomp. Rock.)	M.Comp. Wet Rec:9"	- 1		
	End of Boring at 12'5  GWO -1'O at "C" Hrs.						Loose Wet	2-2		
(_	Remarks:  Augered to 12'5 to install well at 12'0	-		<b>191</b> 2		Refusal at 19'8 End of Boring at 19'8	Dense Wet Rec:0"	120/3"		
:						@#Installed CM at 191	5			
;						Remarks:				
			<del></del> <del></del>				•			
(				-			1	1		


FIELD - 4 CONTENT

GNA - 40 to 50% - 10 to 40%

SOME

<sup>1</sup> COL. A Blows on Cosing
2 COL. B Blows on 13/3" Sampler (I.D.)
3 HAMMER = 140 %; FALL 30"
4 SAMPLER = O. D. SPLII SPOON

## THOMASTON



# RESURVOIR

11/11/	Y ROXIN ASOMRY	PATE :	BLE CORN	OF- 10-12	<u>.</u>	
/X	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·			. ^	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- <u>-</u>	Y	Y	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	<u> </u>

\* PIEZONE TER IN BORNIA \* PIEZONE TER H. HALL AUGER HOLE

120

FIG. 1 SITE PLAN BORNO LOCATIONS 869.0136

S. E. MINOR & CO., Inc.
CIVIL ENGINEERS

161 MASON STREET
GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT 06830

July 15, 1974

State of Connecticut
Department of Environmental Protection
State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Attention: Mr. Victor F. Galgowski

Superintendent of Dam Maintenance

Water and Related Resources

Re: Plymouth Reservoir
Plymouth, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Galgowski:

In accordance with your request, we have examined the subject dam in order to ascertain its structural soundness and stability. Prior to our visit to the site, we went to the Town Hall offices and attempted to obtain any structural drawings of the subject installation. We were advised that no plans were on file and that the Town Officials had no knowledge whatsoever of the construction of the dam.

Upon our visit to the site, we found the Plymouth Reservoir dam to be an earth dam with a total length of approximately 700 feet. There is a concrete spillway with concrete cheek walls and stone steps, which have a total drop of approximately 25 feet. The earth section of the dam is approximately 20 feet wide on the top and has an earth slope on the wet side of approximately one foot on five feet. The earth slope on the face of the dam is approximately one foot on three feet.

During our visit to the site, we took several photographs and have numbered the reverse side of same for reference in this report.

The concrete spillway has a rectangular weir approximately 10 feet long with a wooden 2" by 6" set in the molded slots, as shown in Photos No. 3 and 4. There is approximately 2 1/2 feet of freeboard. There was no evidence whatsoever of any overtopping or danger thereof. The concrete spillway together with the cheek walls appear in very good condition and need little maintenance at present. The only recommended maintenance would be to rechink some of the stone steps, as evidenced in Photo No. 5. In addition, the westerly end of the southerly wingwall is leaning forward from the construction joint westerly, as evidenced in Photo No. 6. It is my considered opinion that this section of the cheek wall should be removed and replaced in an upright position.

00 14 Nx=7 5/75 State of Connecticut Page 2 July 15, 1974

It is our considered opinion that the dam at Plymouth Reservoir requires attention at this time. While we do not feel that structural failure of the dam is imminent, we do feel that certain symptoms evident at this time require further investigation. As indicated on the plan accompanying this report, there are several spongy areas between the dam and the North Street pavement. These spongy areas exist both to the north and south of the spillway. In addition to this, there is water coming through the pavement as indicated on the sketch and running into the open ditch adjacent to the pavement. There are several ways available for curing these deficiencies; however, further investigation must take place in order to ascertain which remedy would be most economical. In the event that valves and piping are available to lower the level of the reservoir, it would be most advantageous to take corrective steps on the back of the dam rather than on the face. Additional investigation would reveal if this possibility exists.

We hereby recommend that the owner of the dam authorize an investigation in the very near future in order that the preventive maintenance can be completed prior to additional deterioration and possible future failure.


Respectfully submitted,


S. E. MINOR & CO., INC.


Edward F. Ahneman, Jr.

Chief Engineer


EFA:1b









10 K 10 10 HP 19 INCH



PLY MEUTH	7683875	Vice Dir	75.7 60/cc.5	6.08 - 62.50 A - 57.213	
12 M	1	1 %	7		
			94.29		
00 C(1) # 468 9:13	164.02				
0.9 #13		11.45	72.40		-
0.8* اگ		۲۲ ع	95.25	6	-
0 0, 4 11		41.0	103.28	51	
		6.35	47.67	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$	
I		6.26	27.78	9	- 1
0.8 2.8		11.62	52,76	0 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	;
6 + 80		/1.45	52.57	a	
0.4 10		9.7%	94.26		
+1 BC		12.25	91.14	्रा १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १ १	
	nerk of	S. 77 (501/2)	NAME OF SE		15
\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\					Ĥ
S. W.		9.70	75.12	χν.	7.51:
S. E. z.		336	45.001	יירר	7
•		7.33	66.69	45	-
ند		3 6.4	100,33		
0.6 # 15		13.45	50.57	2133	
				9	
Chak 12		9,1.3			
21.27.6.12.6.13					
3		11.7	94.31		-}t
		****			_





4-2-01		;	i.	
\$2.00-a			!	
			( (	
P7-8-4				
3(-4-7)	DKX	DRY	DRY	DR.
11-2-78				
901 - 301 - 3 201 - 3				
86-9-9	D.K.Y.	DRY-	DRY	ORK
35-5-8		1		
31-8-4		•		
84-3-8				
84-42-1	0R1 -	DRY.	DRY	08.4
ال 81-77-1	1	•		•
2 8C-EZ-1		;		
84-81-1				
84-7-1				
80-8-1	) 5	DRY	280	280
= <<-52-21	- DRY			
((-55-51				
46-91-51		7 ¥ 3	7	0 R Y
12-81-21	0 67	3	280	<i>o</i> 1
44-21-21				
LL- <b>9-</b> T1		•		
LL-9-E1				
CZ-3E-11	レベイ	D R.	0 8 4 1	ORY
۷4-91 <del>- 1</del> 1	2	40	0	1
. 1		<b>3</b>		اي ب
	21-3	51-3	41-3	\$ 51-03

8 - 58

APPENDIX C

PHOTOGRAPHS

wat to a friend the state of the state of






PHOTO NO. 1

DAM FROM RIGHT ABUTMENT. NOTE WELL AT RIGHT END OF CREST AND STONE FILLED GABIONS AT DOWNSTREAM TOE AND SPILLWAY.



PHOTO NO. 2

CREST AND UPSTREAM SLOPE FROM RIGHT ABUTMENT.
NOTE LACK OF RIPRAP ABOVE WATER LEVEL.

U S ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM
TRIB. TO NAUGATUCE RIV.
PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUT
CT 00286
28 APRIL '81



PHOTO NO. 3

UPSTREAM SLOPE AND CREST.
NOTE LACK OF RIPRAP ABOVE
WATERLINE AND TIRE PATHS
ON CREST.



PHOTO NO. 4

WET AREA
ON DOWNSTREAM
SLOPE.

U S ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM TRIB. TO NAUGATUCK RIV. PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUT CT 00286

28 APRIL 181



PHOTO NO. 5

SEEPAGE AT EDGE OF ROAD NEAR LEFT END OF DAM. FLOW AT DOWNSTREAM END OF PIPE APPROXIMATELY 1 GPM.




PHOTO NO. 6

STONE GABIONS AND
STONE MAT AT END
OF SPILLWAY DISCHARGE CHANNEL. NOTE
48" CULVERT UNDER
ROAD, 8" ACCMP DUTLETS FOR TOE DRAIN AT
LEFT AND RIGHT, AND
15" CMP DRAIN AT
RIGHT. FLOW IN 15"CMP
DRAIN APPROXIMATELY
5 GPM.

USARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM TRIB. TO NAUGATUCK RIV. PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUT

CT 00286

28 APRIL '81



PHOTE NO. 7

SPILLWAY FROM DOWNSTREAM. NOTE STONE MAD NATE PELOW CONCRETE WEIR.



#### PHOTO NO. 8

LEFT SPILLWAY TRAINING WALL.
NOTE REDUCTION OF SPILLWAY
LENGTH DUE TO LOCATION OF
GABIONS INSIDE OF CONCRETE
TRAINING WALLS.

U S ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM
TRIB. TO NAUGATUCK RIV.
PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUI
CT 00286
28 APRIL '81



PHOTO NO. 9




PHOTO NO. 10

INSIDE OF GATEHOUSE, NOTE "CREEN CHAMBER, HAND WHEEL GATE OPERATORS AND COMPRESSOR FOR AERATION SYSTEM.

U S ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM TRIB. TO NAUGATUCK RIV. PLYMOUTH, CONNECTIOUT

CT 00286 28 APRIL '81



PHOTO NO. 11

DIET ENT OF 1 HINCH HOW OF.



PHOTO NO. 12

EMERGENCY SPILLWAY AT LEFT END OF DAM.

NOTE MANHOLE FOR THE DRAIN.


U S ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC. CONCOCTING ENGINEERS WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM TRIP, TO NAUGATUCK RIV. FLYMOTH, UNR TIQUT CI ....

#### APPENDIX D

HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS


-




ROALD HAESTAD, INC. SHEET NO. OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS

CKD BY AR DATE 7/27/81 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 00708 JOB NO. 11. March

SUBJECT PAYMOUTH RESERVOIS JAM-Project SIEGHRIGE TOPICITY



Dam Profile: (Not to scale)



Q=UH3/2

Dom Embankment discharge coeff. = 2.7 Gabions discharge coefficient = 2.5

Elev.	· Discl	harge Capaci		Total Discharge
(feet)		002/0//3		Copacity - cfs
692	0	0	0	0
693	98	0	C	. 98
694	278	9	0	278
694.5	388	20	0	708
695	5//	33	668	1,212
69 <b>6</b>	786	67	3472	4,325
697	1099	107	7471	8,677
	,	•		
694 694.5 695 696	278 388 <i>5//</i> 786	9 20 33 67	0 668 3472	278 768 1,212 4,32

BY DATE MENSE	ROALD HAESTAD, INC.	SHEET NO OF
CKD BY THE DATE TARTE	37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. (1670)	JOB NO MORE TO
SUBJECT PLYMQUTH RE	ESERVOIR DAM-Project	tislissharge samety.
		M
	2.00	8 0 75
		N 3
	28	SAMPS
و المستداد ا والمستداد المستداد المستد		7. 692.( D/SC
	\ 1	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N
		SP144
69,	8 6	26, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28

BY JAG DATE TO	ROALD HAESTAD, INC.	SHEET NO OF
	CONSULTING ENGINEERS	JOB NO 4/5-27-
	PES. DAM-Surdange ST	

Elev (feet)	Surface Area (Acres)	Average Surface Area	Surenarge Storage Cap (Az:Ft)
692,0	36.7 *	37. <i>5</i> 0	0
693.0	38.3	3 <i>7.30</i> 3 <i>9.10</i>	38
694.0	39.9	40.30	77
6 <i>94.5</i>	40.7	41.10	97
695	41.5	42.35	117
696	43.2	44.80	160
698	46.4	48.00	249
700	49.6	, 3. 3	345

<sup>\*</sup> The surface area at spillway level was obtained from the Connecticut Water Co. .

BY DATE	ROALD HAESTAD, INC. SHEET NO. CONSULTING ENGINEERS	OF
CKD BY DATE	37 Brookside Road - Waterbury Conn 06708 JDB ND	
SUBJECT PLYMOUTH F	ESE FIVOIR DAM - Surcharge Straige	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		063
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	122
	0,	
		8 +
		13 /0
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		The state of the s
	$\vec{c}$	8
		23 74
		W
		46
		0 0
		8 572
		V)
		35
		75
		T.
		8
		75
	4	20
	₹	
	7	
		3.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	N
<b>N N</b>	<i>w</i> 2 <i>w</i>	<u>7</u> 0
6	65	9
	LAAI-NOILUNATA	• •

BY STEDATE SECO	ROALD HAESTAD, INC.	SHEET NOOF
CKD BY DATE	CONSULTING ENGINEERS 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06108	JCB NO 3 2
OLVACUTH	DESERVOIR DAMETELT	End

#### TEST FLOOD = 1/2 PMF

Drainage Area = 363 Acres . C.57 Equare miles Using Corps of Eng. chart for Rolling" Terrain MPF = 2,125 cfs/sq.mi. (2.0 sq.mi Minimum) PMF = 2,125 cfs/sq.mi. X 0.57 sq.mi. = 1,204 cfs 1/2 PMF = 1/2 (1,204 cfs) = 602 use 600 cfs Op, = 600 cfs HI = 2.7 ft, above Epillway, from Discharge Curve

STOR, = 105 ac-ft, from Storage capacity curve = 3.5" of runoff from 0.57 Eg. mi.

Note: MPF Runoff in New England equals approximately 19". Therefore 12 PMF Runoff equals approximately 1/2(19) = 9.5".

Opz = Opl (1- STORI/9.5) = 600 (1-3.5/9.5) = 379 cfs

Hz = 2.4 ft STOR, = 93 ac-ft

STORAVE = (STOR, + STOR, )/2 = (105+93)/2 = 99 ac-ft = 3.3' of runoff

QP3 = QP1 (1- STOR AVE/9.5) = 600 (1- 3.3/9.5) = 391.6 USE 390cfs H3 = 2.5 ft

Spillway discharge capacity = 408 cfs (at top of dam)

% of Test Flood = (408/390) x100 = 104.6 use 105% (1/2 PMF)

BY . FATE DATE THE ZAL	ROALD HAESTAD, INC.	SHEET NO OF
CKD BY DATE A LANGE	CONSULTING ENGINEERS 37 Bronkside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708	JOB NO.
SUBJECT PAYMOUTH F	RES. DAM-Dom breach	salsa lations

S= Storage at time of failure with water level at top of dam.

S= Storage at spillway level + Surcharge storage

S= (95 x106 gal x \_\_lac\_ft\_\_) + 97 Ac\_Ft (From surcharge storage capacity curve)

S= 291.5 Ac\_Ft + 97 Ac\_Ft = 388.5 Use 390 Ac\_Ft.

Note: The storage capacity at spillway level was obtained from the Connecticut Water Company.

$$Q_{PI} = \frac{8}{27} (152) \sqrt{32.2} (16)^{\frac{3}{2}}$$
  
= 16,356 use 16,500 cfs

CED BY JOS DATE JOS COMMUNICATION OF THE MODELL OF THE STATE OF THE SUBJECT PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM-DUPTH OF FLOW

## SECTION NUMBER 1

#### NORTH STREET

HEIGHT ABOVE INVERT (FEET)	<b>D</b>	s i	C H A R CONDUIT (CFS)	G E C A SPILLWAY (CFS)	P A C I T Y TOTAL (CFS)
1.0			12	0	12
2.0			24	0	24
3.0			52	0	52
4.0			80	0	80
5.0			105	0	165
გ.0			130	0	130
7.0			146	0	146
8.0			162	O	162
9.0			179	0	179
1.0.0			195	313	507
11.0			208	884	1091
12.0			220	1899	2119
13.0			231 •	3278	3509
14.0			242	5148	5390
15.0			252	7429	7681
1.6.0			262	10231	10493
17.0			277	13478	13755
18.0			292	17285	17577
19.0			296	21577	21873
20.0			300	26456	26756

REACH OUTFLOW=QP2= 16500 CFS HEIGHT ABOVE CONDUIT INVERT=H2= 17.7 FT.

DATE	ROALD HAESTAD, INC. SHEET NO CONSULTING ENGINEERS 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JDB. ND	of
SUBJECT	^ · · - · · - · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•••••••••
	· .	
SECTION NO 1 (A	ONTH STREET; 62012 17/2	1121 / Hun 2
FIELD SURVEYED		ici Vert
	• • • • • • • • • •	
1-2-15 2-1-		AUDI ST SIZA
7-5-	The Parks	GEF THEATMENT
	L, L2	
$L_2 = 110^{\prime}  $ $L_3 = 90^{\prime}  $	18".RCP	
L = 80' L= 81'	GRAQUE EXIL WITH HEADIN	. 163 m.
$L_{b} = .75'$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
ا المام ا المام المام ال		_
· · · · · /8   · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	H= 17.7 FT	
16		
14		
13 13 12		
1 10 10 1		
7 9		
₩ 8 9 7		
7.1.6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
3 2		
,		
0 5 .		.25 33
	. DISCHARGE - 1000 CFS.	
	D-9	

ELD BO LE DATE 4/27/8/ CONSULTING ENGINEERS ON HOLDING ONE

SUBJECT PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM-DEPTH OF FLOW

### SECTION NUMBER 2A

#### MAIN CHANNEL

H	W	A	R	S	V	Q
(FT)	(FI)	(SQ-EI)	(FI)	(FI/FI)	(FIZSEC)	(CFS)
1.0	11	9	0.81	0,0727	5.81	54
2.0	14	21	1.47	0.0727	8,64	181
3.0	17	35	2.03	0.0727	10.71	370
4.0	20	50	2.53	0.0727	12.40	620
5.0	23	67	2.99	0.0727	13.86	934
6.0	25	87	3.43	0.0727	15.18	1314
7.0	28	108	3.88	0.0727	16.49	1777
8.0	28	130	4.65	0.0727	18.61	2414
9.0	28	152	5.44	0.0727	20.66	3134
10.0	28	174	6.23	0.0727	22.61	3928
11.0	28	196	7.02	0.0727	24.48	4791
12.0	28	218	7.81	0.0727	26.28	5722
13.0	28	240	8.60	0.0727	28.02	6718
14.0	28	262	9.39	0.0727	29.71	7777
15.0	28	284	10.17	0.0727	31.35	8897
16.0	28	306	10.96	0.0727	32.96	10076
17.0	28	328	11.75	0.0727	34.52	11314
18.0	28	350	12,54	0.0727	36.05	12608
19.0	28	372	13.33	0.0727	37.54	13958
20.0	28	394	14.12	0.0727	39.01	15363

MANNING COEFFICIENT=N=0.0600

ET SAL DATE 4/2/8/ KOALD HALCTAD INC. MELT NO OF SALD BY TO DATE - -- SALD CONSULTING ENGINEERS ON MAY MAY MAY

SUBJECT PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM-DEPTH OF FLOW

### SECTION NUMBER 2B

#### LEFT OVERBANK

Н	W	Α	R	S	٧	Q (and )
(FT)	(FT)	(SQ-FT)	(FT)	(FT/FT)	(FI/SEC)	(CFS)
	Access speller franks allefte					
8.0	.7	3	0.45	0.0727	2.93	1.0
	16	15	0.94	0.0727	4.82	71
9.0	24	35	1.47	0.0727	6.47	223
10.0		60	2,20	0,0727	8.46	504
11.0	27		2.87	0.0727	10.11	891
12.0	31	88			11.55	1387
13.0	34	120	3,50	0,0727		
14.0	38	156	4.10	0.0727	12.89	1996
15.0	42	194	4,68	0.0727	14.02	2726
	45	237	5.25	0.0727	15.13	3582
16.0			5,80	0.0727	16.17	4569
17.0	49	283		0.0727	17.17	5696
18.0	52	332	6.35	•		6116
19.0	72	394	5.46	0.0727	15.54	
20.0	74	465	6.30	0.0727	17.09	7945

MANNING COEFFICIENT=N=0.0800

SUBJECT PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR DAM-DEPTH OF FLOW

### SECTION NUMBER 20

#### RIGHT OVERBANK

Н	W	A	R	S	V	Q
(FT)	(FT)	(SQ-FT)	<u>(FT)</u>	(FT/FT)	(FIZSEC)	(CFS)
7 0	2		0.10	0.0727	0.86	
7.0		_			-	
8.0	11	7	0.60	0.0727	2.84	<b>1</b> 5'
9.0	21	23	1.09	0.0727	4.25	96
10.0	30	48	1.59	0.0727	5.46	261
11.0	39	82	2.09	0.0727	6.55	540
12.0	49	126	2.59	0.0727	7.55	959
13.0	58	180	3.08	0.0727	8.49	1525
14.0	68	242	3.58	0.0727	9.38	2273
15.0	75	314	4.17	0.0727	10.38	3259
16.0	81	392	4.84	0.0727	11,46	4486
17.0	87	475	5,48	0.0727	12.45	5912
18.0	92	564	6.10	0.0727	13.38	7541
19.0	98	658	6.71	0.0727	14.26	9381
20.0	104	758	7.31	0.0727	15.09	11437

MANNING COEFFICIENT=N=0.1000

EN COMPANY OF BOOKEN FOR AND THE STATE OF SUBJECT PLYMOUTH PLSERVOIR DAM-DEPTH OF FLOW

#### SECTION NUMBER 2

#### TOTAL SECTION

A R E A (SO.FT.) LISCHARGE (CLS) H C TOTAL A B C 1.0 0 9
0 21
0 35
0 50
0 67
0 87
0 108
7 140
23 189
48 256
82 338
126 432
180 540 5,4 2.0 3.0 4.0 ő 5.0 6.0 7.0 () 8.0 19 96 261 -3 9.0 10.0 11.0 54.0 12.0 540 13.0 14.0 792 15.0 16.0 17.0 1.085 18.0 19.0 20.0 

> REACH OUTFLOW=QP2= 16500 CFS DEPTH OF FLOW=H2= 15.5 FT.

DATE CKD BY MEDATE 47-20-8/	ROALD HAESTAD, INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. (6)706	SHEET NO
SUBJECT	grein for her end to the life of	
5-2-311130	4000	
SECTION LOS A	عد الحد الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الل	T\$ , = 122
	$\mathcal{L}$	
1 1 1/2, F 2006 1 1 1 1		
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 =	
$S = \Delta . \Delta 727. $		
	1 - 1 - 2 1 - 2 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 -	
BUAL BOAL		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
	· ·	
— 2 <u>4</u> 1 · · · · · ·	= 9' CHANEL	
3 3		
7 7		
K 16	H = 15.5 FT	
1 15		
14 - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2 /2	N	•
$A = \begin{pmatrix} A & A & A & A & A & A & A & A & A & A$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	2	
	· 18 ·	
3 - 3 3 3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
7 - 7	11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
4 6 +	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
",		
3		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
,o L		
<u> </u>	<i>1</i> 0 ,	20 25 SU
+ + - + - + - + - + - + - + - + - + - +	DISCHARGE - 1000 CFS	
- 1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		en e
		• • •

EX CAZ INCH WAS EXCEPTED FOR DEPTH OF FLOW

## SECTION NUMBER 3

#### RAILROAD STREET

HEIGHT ABOVE INVERT (FEET)	I)	I	S	H DUIT ES)	A	R	G E SPILLWA (CFS)	Y C	۸	Ь	A T 0 1 C C F	C [AL [ <u>S.)</u>	1	Ť	Y
1.0				19				0				1 '	9		
2.0				38				0				3			
3.0				73			1	0				7			
4.0				108			I	0				10			
5.0				135			(	0				13			
6.0				162			1	Û				163			
7.0				184			1	0				18	4		
8.0				205			(	D				205	5		
9.0				223			288	3				510			
10.0				240			810	3			1	050	3		
11.0				255			1608	5			1	86:	1		
12.0				270			2618	3			2	888	3		
13.0				285			3799	7			14	0.80	-}		
14.0				300			5125	J			r:	4.25	5		
15.0				310			6670	)			6	980	3		
16.0				320			8408				8	726	5		
17.0				330			10301				1.0	631	Į.		
18.0				340			12337				1.2	677	7		
19.0				348			14655				15	002	2		
20.0				355			17219	)			1.7	574	ŀ		

REACH OUTFLOW=QP2= 16500 CFS HEIGHT ABOVE CONDUIT ID/ERT=H2= 19.6 FT.

BYDATE	ROALD HAESTAD, CONSULTING ENGINEER		OF
CKD BY MEDATE AND SE	37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Con		······
SUBJECT. Fand in Tal Fait	5-00 - 100-25	(SE 5, 1)	
		4	
<u> </u>	RABOAD STREET,	- BORLE: 1 = 1834 - 1 = 18	
			<b>42</b> 7 7 7 7
C = 25			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		777	
$\frac{\lambda_2 - 35}{100}$			
~ ~ €0'	<del>,</del>		
		λ <sub>3</sub>	
	1/2		
	L.		
		BRAEWAY .	•
	AMONE	ACCMP	
		W-W/HEADWALL	
		Ī	
24 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	4=196F7,		
/8			
		1	
15		•	
Li +5		1	
13-13-1	en eremente en la crista en la c La crista en la crista e	Q	
12		8	
11 15	<del></del>	18	•
9 /		9 .	
8		G.	•
7	· · · · · · ·		
4	en e	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • •
4		<del> </del>	
3			
2		∦ : ↓ - ↓	
		<u> </u>	
<u></u>	10		25 31

the first of the second of the contract of the second of t

SUBJECT PLYMOUTH BEST PROTE DOM: DEPTH OF TEOU

## SECTION NUMBER 4

#### RATEROAD TRACKS

HEIGHT ABOVE INVERT (FEET)	D J S C COMBUIT #1 (CFS)	H A R G CONDUIT #2 (CES)	E C A CONDUIT #3 (CFS)	P A C SPILLWAY CCFS)	TOTAL
1.0	14	()	12	9	26
2.0	28	Ü	$\overline{24}$	Ü	5.7
3.0	59	0	4.8	Û	107
4.0	9.0	0	72	υ	162
5.0	123	0	92	Ð	215
6.0	155	Ü	1.1.3	Ü	268
7.0	179	0	128	Ü	306
8.0	203	0	142	0	345
9.0	226	0	155	0	381
10.0	250	77	168	0	<b>ц</b> 95
11.0	266	155	179	()	600
1.2.0	283	233	1.90	θ	7.05
13.0	299	310	198	Ü	807
14.0	315	457	206	Ü	658
15.0	329	604	214	()	1147
16.0	343	752	222	Ü	1316
17.0	356	899	232	Ü	1987
18.0	370	1081	241	()	1690
19.0	381	1263	251	0	1895
20.0	393	1445	260	Û	2098
21.0	կ () կ	1628	266	ſJ	2298
22.0	415	1802	273	(I	्रम् हर
23.0	<b>424</b>	1976	279	0	2679
24,0	433	2151	285	0	2868
25.0	441	2325	289	0	3055
26.0	450	2461	293	2160	5363
27.0	462	2576	296	6109	9464
28.0	475	2732	300	11554	14731
29.0	487	2868	304	17200	20934
30.0	500	3003	308	243170	27860

REACH OUTFLOW=QP2= 16500 CLS HEIGHT ABOVE CONDUIT INVERT=H2= 28.3 FT.

JECT	5		=	•••••
SECTION N.	2 2 (12 Sections	There is a series of	Cin 2:1 -1.	_ 1 - 4 -4
		enterential, 80		4 . 4 mm
	•			†
<u> </u>				
	LACAL TRACKS			
•	• • • • • • •			
		. BRINGE CPENIN . 15.5'W X. 12'.H	1 1	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		. \$ 0°-EXTENSIO	1 1	
		OF 51353		
<del>-</del>		•	!—.	
<del></del>	·	•		
	<b></b> 5'ACP.			
	. Square enge	<u>.</u>	417.2.	
- · · · · · · · ·	WITH HEADWA	انگ	SQUA-5	
	WITH HEADWA		SQUARE WETH HE	
	WITH HEADWA			
· · · · 36   · · ·				
30	W.TH. HEALWA			
30				
30				
30				
			WITH WE	
20 -				
			= 16.500 CFS	
20 -			16,500 CF3.	
7074 20			= 16.500 CFS	
14-7-10 20 - 1-12 10 10 11 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			Q=16.500 CF3	
17 17 20 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			Q=16.500 CF3	
17 17 20 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			Q=16.500 CF3	
0 20 - FLO LATE FLO LATE FOR THE FEB.	H=28.3	F7.	Q=16,500 CF3.	
DETOTAL OF FLUIS 1	H=28.3	F7.	Q=16,500CF3.	2.25.

BYDATE	ROALD HAESTAD, INC.	SHEET NOOF
CKD BY SAGDATE 17-34-81	CONSULTING ENGINEERS  37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708	JOB NO
SUBJECT FLYMS T TE		

# PLANIMETER REFLINGS:

\* WATER SUBFREE: THIRD 25,97 33, IN 6.28 E4.89
EL 692 FIRST 25,22 30, IN 0.38 ULT E4.9 ACRES
57,977 24.84 30, IN,


CONTOUR 700: THIRD 4.85 SQ.IM. 0.54 49.59

FIRST 5.78 SQ.IM. 0.54 455 49.6 ACHTS

START 3.24 SQ.IM.

(XIRTERSHED: THIRD 29,34 SQ.IN 3,95 C.EVISQ.MI. FIRST 21,45 CQ.IN 3,75 START 17,50 SQ.IN.

\* THE CONNECTION WATER COMPANY
SUPPLIED US WITH A WATER SURFACE
AREA OF SUT FORES AT SPILLWAY
LEVEL, THIS WALLE WAS ASSUMED TO RE
MORE ACCUMENTE THAN THE PLANMETERILL
VALUE AND THEREFORE WAS DIER IN



#### APPENDIX E

INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN

THE NATIONAL INVENTORY OF DAMS

NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME

er il manufatti pattitich zen immer

